

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. II.

JULY, 1896.

No. 3.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church; a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
STORMONT & JACKSON,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE

Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. II.

JULY, 1896.

No. 3.

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.¹

I am glad to have the privilege of raising my voice in the cause of International Arbitration. I do so in the name of the Catholic University of America, and I am confident that, in emphatically endorsing the efforts of this assemblage in behalf of international justice and peace through arbitration, I am uttering the sentiment of the millions of Catholics throughout the land.

Who that is a man, and especially who that is a Christian, or a believer in religion at all, could fail to sympathize with such a cause? Eminent statesmen and economists have discoursed to you on the practical facts which demonstrate the disastrousness of war, and the desirableness of making arbitration its substitute in settling the quarrels of the nations. Let me ask you to glance at the subject in the light of the principles which constitute us men and Christians.

As long as men are men, limited in intelligence and biassed by selfish interests, there will be disputes between men and between nations. But men and nations are bound to settle their disputes in a human, that is in a reasonable, manner. Brutes settle their disputes with

¹Discourse delivered by the Right Reverend Rector of the University at the Peace Congress held at Washington, D. C., Thursday, April 23, 1896.

tooth and claw. Savages settle them with bludgeon and tomahawk. Men that cannot claim the excuse of savage ignorance are bound by the eternal laws of their being to settle them by the rule of truth and justice.

"But," it may be asked, "who is to decide what is true and just but the parties concerned?" Not at all; good sense and justice declare that no one is judge in his own cause. One of the first principles of civilization, of the social organization of human beings on the basis of reason, is that disputes should be settled by the sentence of a competent and disinterested judge. Mere individualism, the system of every man for himself, is excluded by the very rudiments of civilization. And could we for one moment imagine that such a system of savagery would be right as between nations, when it is manifestly wrong as between the individuals composing the nations? Far from it. The greater majesty of the nation imposes all the weightier obligation of acting in all things by the direction of enlightened reason, in nothing by the impulse of savage violence and brute power.

Self-defence is a universally accepted right. But even the right of self-defence is amenable to law and order. It is only under the pressure of exceptional necessity that it may take the law in its own hands and assert justice or repel wrong by its own strength. All things must be done according to order or they are not done rightly.

Militarism was introduced into the world by greed for plunder, by its outgrowth, lust of conquest, and by consequent need of self-defence. Such causes and their sad effect would naturally be eliminated by the advance of civilization. But there are kindred causes ever at work which have thus far maintained militarism as the disgrace and the curse of civilization. Cæsarism sees in it the tool of its ambition, the rampart of its tyranny; but the civilized world is sick of Cæsarism; the great providential tide of democracy and liberty is moving irresistibly onward, and, with Cæsarism, militarism must go.

It has been upheld by the spirit of nationalistic ex-

clusiveness, by that fell spirit, the curse of the old world in past ages, which has made men suspect and hate one another, century after century, because they were born on opposite sides of a river or of an imaginary boundary line. But of that the world is getting sick and tired. Our country has shown mankind that men of all nationalities, coming from countries armed to the teeth against each other for centuries, can meet and mingle as fellow-men, as fellow-citizens, and blend into a united and homogeneous people. Our country is giving the keynote of the future. Everywhere the cry is for the federation of the nations, the brotherhood of mankind. The demand, the movement is irresistible, and, with the insane spirit of narrow nationalism, militarism must go.

It has been upheld by every spirit that has impelled men to hate one another; and, alas! with shame and sorrow we have to acknowledge that men of hate have been cunning in using every motive, even the purest and noblest and holiest, as incentives to the spirit of faction and of sect, as incentives to make men suspect and ostracise and hate and kill one another, for the love of country forsooth, for the love of creed, yea, for the love of God! As Americans we blush to have to acknowledge that even in our own land of equal rights, of civil and religious liberty, of universal brotherhood, the hiss of that serpent of hate is occasionally heard, and its fangs aim death-blows in the dark. The trail of that serpent has been over all history, and its venom has had much to do with the sanguinary wars and the deep-rooted militarism of the past. But the world is sick of it. Only vile or fanatical souls now side with it. The spirit of mutual hatred is from below, is shameful and unworthy and must pass away, and in its slimy folds may it drag militarism with it.

We look to a higher Ideal,—to Him who was foretold as the Prince of Peace; to Him at whose birth the angels proclaimed “Peace on earth to men of good will;” to Him whose salutation was ever, “Peace be with you;” to Him

whose legacy was, "Peace I leave you, my peace I give you ;" to Him who said, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." This is the spirit of Christian civilization, for nations as for individuals. The world is meant to be governed, and assuredly must yet be governed, not by hatred and violence and might, but by love and justice and right. Nothing else can be lasting and permanently successful. Justice alone is mighty ; love alone is everlasting ; truth alone can ultimately prevail ; for these are the spirit of the eternal God. What is propped by cannon and bayonets must topple over at last ; only truth and justice are immovable and remain forever.

But how, it will be asked, can so exalted an ideal be realized among men ? Considering the panorama of blood and carnage presented by history ; considering the fact that at this moment the most civilized nations of the earth are armed to the teeth as if for universal war, and annually clamor in their parliaments for stronger and stronger armaments ; considering that even in our own country the war-spirit has lately been so rife and that the most imperative and most popular demand just now is for more army, more navy, more and more enginery of offence and defence ;—considering all this, how do sensible people expect that the era of hatred and violence can be brought to a close, and the era of justice and peace inaugurated ? The answer is manifest ; only through such a system of international arbitration as is here proposed. The system of courts, so wisely provided in every civilized country for settling disputes among the citizens, must manifestly be extended to the nations for the settling of differences among them. The quarrels of the nations must be settled, not like those of pulling and scratching children, but like those of reasonable grown-up men, by equity and law. Not the brawl, nor the duel, nor the feud, but the court must be the resource of nations as of men. Every one knows that this is true. The nations recognize it in their hearts. They arm and arm for conflict simply because

there is no court before which their quarrels can be laid. If there were, then very shame of the principles and methods of savagery would soon coerce them to disarmament. Our own country has recently been forced to face the possibilities of war, not because she desires it, but simply because there is no court to which national quarrels must be brought; and men who love peace have been compelled to say to our country: "Go to war, if you needs must, for the sake of principle," simply because, as things are, there is no other established means for the assertion of international principle and the maintenance of international right.

But things should not be left so. It is a shame that they are so now, at the close of the nineteenth century. It will be a far greater shame if we leave them so in the twentieth. The difficulties of the reform are no reason why it should not be undertaken. Any fool or poltroon can conjure up difficulties. The duty of the wise and the brave is to face them, and with mingled prudence and strength to overcome them. There will assuredly be difficulties, and serious ones, in the devising and organizing of a system of international judiciary; difficulties in the establishing of the tribunal or tribunals to which the nations can safely trust the settlement of their disputes; difficulties as to the international police power that will, if necessary, enforce sentences, for the tribunals of the world have not yet learned, and probably never will learn, to dispense with the strong arm of authority. But these difficulties are certainly not insurmountable. Let international good will and good sense once take the problem resolutely in hand and difficulties will disappear or gradually reach their solution.

There is a great deal of calm good will and practical good sense in the English-speaking races. In God's name, let them start the glorious experiment, and all the nations will yet rise up and call them blessed.

JOHN J. KEANE.

ON THE HELLENIC PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK.

Perhaps the question of the pronunciation of Greek has for me more of practical interest than it has for most other Western Hellenists. They do not believe in learning or teaching how to speak Greek. I, however, am one of those who continue to regard the fine Greek language as still sufficiently alive to be speakable, and likely to retain that life for ages yet. And since one can not speak without pronouncing, the question of pronunciation is to me of high importance.

Much learned labor has already been expended in collecting material and arguments bearing on this question. Two hostile camps of investigators are in the field. Much truth is discovered by either party, and, indeed, we think it safe to accept nearly all their positive conclusions. Two opposite leaders are Blass¹, who contends for the method of Erasmus, and Papa Demetrikopoulos², who hotly defends the pronunciation which Greeks use to-day. It is on the information furnished us by them, by Blass as well as by the Greek of long name, that we base the following general remarks :

I.

It need not here be proved that a living language continually undergoes changes in its pronunciation. Only dead languages take on rigid and unchangeable forms. This is also not the proper place to inquire into how the Greek language was pronounced at different stages of its

¹The Pronunciation of Ancient Greek; translated from the Third German Edition of Dr. Blass, by W. J. Purton, Cambridge, 1890.

²Βίσανος τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Ηροφορᾶς Ἐρασμικῶν Ἀποδείξεων, ὅπὸ Θεοδώρου Παπα Δημητρακοπούλου. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1889.

past life. That is being well done by capable specialists. Still, in passing, we shall have occasion to note the numerous and serious difficulties which a layman may see. We start out in the belief that, on the one hand, it is in the specialist's province to tell us how the language was pronounced at various historic times as far as he can do so, while on the other, it is in our province to say which of the various historic pronunciations we should adopt in practice when we read a passage of Greek aloud, or wish to speak in that tongue.

It is, indeed, one thing to know that the Greeks in different countries and at different times have had different pronunciations, and another thing to think that we should be always ready to warp our tongues into pronouncing with historical accuracy whatever variety or sample of Greek language we may have before us. In English it would be very odd as well as useless to change our pronunciation when we wish to read something in English written by a man whose country or whose century is different from ours. How difficult it would be to have one pronunciation when we read the *London Times*, another for the newspapers of Dublin, a third variety when we take up the *New York Sun*, and still another for a California daily ; or again, if we had to have different pronunciations for different times, one for Shakespeare, and another for Newman ; worse than all, what would we do in case we could not easily decide when or where a certain article was written ? We would then be compelled in scientific solicitude not to read at all, or at least not to pronounce any of the doubtful words.

The conclusion which I wish to arrive at is, that just as we must practically get along in English, each of us, with one pronunciation, although we may know that such a course is not scientifically what we might desire, so also in Greek must the same thing occur. And we must in practice adopt one variety of pronunciation out of the many which we know or suppose to be genuinely Greek, and pronounce all varieties of Greek by a method which

belongs properly only to one single variety of the language.

Now since the Greek language has already lived a life of some three thousand years, the variety of pronunciations in it must be very large. We do not know them all. Nor have we exhaustive knowledge about any of them, save perhaps of one. The two opposite schools mentioned above are the Erasmianists and the defenders of another system which we are going to call the Hellenic. Although few men indeed should profess to know with full accuracy the pronunciation used for example at a symposium in the days of Plato, yet the Erasmianists base the arguments in favor of their system on the very plea that it faithfully represents that ancient phase of pronunciation. On the other hand the Hellenicists advance as their chief argument the fact that theirs is admittedly a widespread and actual pronunciation of at least the present phase of the living language.

II.

The practical question put to us is, which of these two are we going to adopt? We have no other choice. For although there are some teachers who still cling to private systems of their own or of their literary clique, so to speak, such as those who pronounce the Greek words as though they were spelled with English letters, or those who still ignore the existence of the written accent and hoax the Latin accent on the Greek word, yet the choice for us remains between the two opposed schools mentioned above.

Both Erasmianists and Hellenicists have the habit of giving to each letter or syllable a fixed value, and of then pronouncing it with this value in whatever word or even whatever dialect it occurs. They go on the principle, without admitting it always in words, that differences in sound ought to be indicated by differences in spelling. This principle is no more true in ancient than it is in modern languages. When people become accustomed to

read and write to any extent, the written word comes to be practically a thought picture which they look on as a unit, and which they do not think necessary to vary in obedience to every variation of the spoken word which expresses that thought in sound. I wish to apply these remarks just now to the language of Homer. When his poems were committed to writing it is quite probable that even though in the reciting of these cantos a more ancient mode of pronunciation was to be heard, yet when the words were first recorded in alphabetic symbols a local method of spelling, which may have represented a late and local pronunciation, was certainly used. Any one who ever has witnessed a modern Greek, for instance, take down in writing a song or folk-lore story from some octogenarian's lips will understand what I refer to. So, if to all the difficulties enumerated by others we add this one, we see that even after knowing the pronunciation in any given place at the time of Sophokles, say Athens, it would still be a hopeless labor to discover the exact sounds of Homer. The changes in pronunciation from Homeric times down to Sophoklean days may have been many and great. From the time of Sophokles, however, writing and other circumstances, such as the firmer character of the language, may have rendered fewer the liabilities to change. At least this might be true in the Attic dialect which began to have a certain rigidity even before the age of Aeschylos.

If mere Greek sources avail but little to teach us the exact pronunciation of "Homeric times," it is evident that for pre-Homeric pronunciation these sources are of still less help. We must have recourse to other means furnished by the comparative study of grammar, etc. It is clear that the conclusions arrived at in these comparative studies may be rendered less certain by our having often to rely upon data whose truth cannot be fully proven, and by our not always being able to give to our data an absolute value, but merely a relative one, so that the truth of any particular item is only relative to the

other items, and may not, perhaps, be itself absolutely and independently true.

Even then if we knew the Sophoklean pronunciation, we would feel that neither could we easily find Homer's therefrom, nor would we imagine it possible to pronounce Homer with scientific correctness by Sophokles' method. Looking in the direction of our own time, we also would not like to be thought to believe that Sophokles' pronunciation is the same as St. Paul's, or as that of St. John Chrysostom, not to mention scholars as late as Photios or Plethon.

Of the two systems in vogue, the one is named from the excellent Greek scholar who devised it, Erasmus of Rotterdam; the other system is variously named, as are many things that have not been fairly treated. One of its names is "The Reuchlinian," after Reuchlin the humanist.

But this name is misleading. We might be entrapped into thinking that just as Erasmus devised the system which bears his name, so also did Reuchlin excogitate the other system. Again, it might lead us to suppose that Reuchlin was one of those who, in this affair, entered into controversy with Erasmus or his disciples and objected to their innovations, and that then his name was accordingly given to the system because he defended it. But this is all wrong. Erasmus and Reuchlin were never antagonists on this point, for the dialogue *de recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronounciatione* first appeared in 1528, and Reuchlin had died in 1523. Nor is Reuchlin in any sense the greatest defender of the system which bears his name. The system had not yet been attacked, and, therefore, needed no defense. Again, the name of "Modern Greek pronunciation" is a poor one, for, although this method is, as a matter of fact, used and loved and defended by the Greek people and their scholars of to-day, yet it is many ages old.

Another name, and the one which may be the best of all, is the "Hellenic" pronunciation. This name would

mean that the pronunciation is one used by the Greeks themselves, or the Hellenes. So its principal defect is that it is somewhat assertive in character. For it almost implies that the pronunciation it represents is the right one to use. However, although in general we are not combative, yet we will in this instance dare to stand by a name which also declares our views. How long this name has been in use I do not know; nor do I know whether its use is extensive. I thought it out for myself, and then found that others had already employed it. "Hellenic," then, is from now on our shibboleth.

III.

Let us put clearly the state of the case as it seems to be:—The Erasmian position is in general, that we ought to pronounce all Greek, classic at least, as Sophokles pronounced in conversation, and that moreover we actually do know how Sophokles really did pronounce. The advocates of the Hellenic system teach practically that we ought to pronounce all Greek as the professors in the University of Athens pronounce to-day. And some of these Hellenicists hold that the pronunciation of to-day is not far removed from that of ancient classic times.

We see that each school starting out from different premises agree at least in this, that it is not practicable to have two pronunciations or more, but that accuracy must give way to practicability, and that the pronunciation suitable to one fixed point in the ever-changing stream of language must be applied to all the others, although the application cannot be made in strict accuracy.

Again, we hold that since the Erasmianists are the ones who set up a system of pronunciation contrary to the one in traditional vogue at the time, it is they who were and are the seceders, and it is they who must explain the reason of their secession, or else not be recognized. It must be continually remembered, however, that in this present paper I oppose to the Hellenicists only those who hold that we ought to actually pronounce all Greek (ex-

cept Romaïc) by the Erasmian method, not those who hold that the Erasmian system really represents some one phase of the ever-changing pronunciation, for so far as I can judge, they may probably be right in this second position.

We feel a certain logical necessity of adhering to what has been handed down to us until we are convinced that tradition is wrong; then it would be our duty to cast it aside. The Erasmianists, starting out on the principle that they ought to pronounce everything as would Sophokles have many difficulties to overcome. They must rely for information chiefly on the spelling of that time, comparing it with previous and subsequent spelling. But at the very beginning it is clear that the Greek alphabet of that time was not accurately phonetic. Orthography, just as all other such practices, is not merely an affair of logical exactitude, but also is subject to habit and established use. Whether the difference between the spelling used in Athens in a certain year and that used by the Ionians of the same year was all due to a corresponding difference in pronunciation, or may not have also been due merely to style or to custom, is something we cannot in many cases now know. We English-speaking people do not have to rack our brains much to understand such statements. The examples in our language are so numerous that one feels them weightless when cited as instances.

We write "labor" and "honor" and the English "labour" and "honour." Still, this difference of spelling is not of itself sufficient to prove a difference of pronunciation in these words here and in England. To learn from a people's writing how they pronounce is possible only when we know the exact value of the letters in their various combinations and know whether they always have the same value or not. This information concerning the language of Sophokles is not easy to find. It might be well not to be any more exacting in this line than in the others. We do not try to reproduce our Greek books on papyrus rolls, nor do we print the words unspaced, nor do

we omit accents and modern marks of punctuation in order to adopt the punctuation marks that we might learn from inscriptions, nor do we raise the iota subscript into line, nor do we fail to divide into paragraphs and to begin sentences with capitals, and to use printing-type usually fashioned after modern Greek script, neglecting the more beautiful forms that we could get from inscriptions ; all of this we allow, because the Byzantine Greeks who came over from the East and taught us our first lessons at the time of the Renaissance led us into the fortunate habit, and there has yet arisen no Erasmus of sufficient moral force to persuade us to spurn these teachings of Byzantine barbarians. Thus we have kept them all. Their language which they heard and studied from boyhood and thought to be the language of their fathers we learned from them, and then began to despise them as corruptors of the language of the old Greeks, whom they henceforth should not dare to regard as their ancestors. Science had broken that delusion for them.

The original Greek alphabet, we can well imagine, did not accurately represent all the sounds of the Greek language. It was an imported, not a home-grown product. So, if that alphabet ever came to fully represent the sounds of the Greek language it was later, after certain changes had been introduced : and whether the few changes introduced into any special form of the alphabet, say the mode of writing in Attika, not only removed original flaws, but also made the alphabet overtake the continual changes in the pronunciation and keep abreast with them, is a question for comparative philologists and alphabet historians, and a question which they will answer in the negative.

That the history of the alphabet contains many and serious gaps is evident to all students of it. When, however, in the time of Eukleides, a few modifications were introduced into the official alphabet at Athens, we cannot say that thereby the Attic alphabet became accurately phonetic, although it became perhaps more phonetic than

it formerly was. The event which took place at Athens on that occasion really was that one imperfect alphabet was substituted for another still more inadequate one. The new substitution continued to have in Athens many of the imperfections which it almost surely had in Ionia. It was the fitting of the alphabet of one dialect on to the language of another. This could not well be done so as to make the new alphabet a perfect receptacle for the old Attic sounds. If a proper alphabet for Ionic it would not be perfectly suited for Attic, but the probability is that it was perfect neither for Ionic nor for Attic.

So we are safe in asserting that difference in spelling does not indicate always a difference in pronunciation, nor does identity in spelling prove identity in pronunciation, for separate letters have, in most languages, no rock-firm sound which of necessity they must be supposed to represent wherever they are met with.

Proofs drawn from etymologies, from puns, from transliterations into other languages, must always be carefully handled. They may mislead. Still, when used aright, they bring information with them.

Other alphabets, like the Koptic, the Gothic, the Russian, and most of all the Latin and its direct derivatives, are all witnesses of some truth or other in regard to pronunciation. They all, together with the other sources of information we have been mentioning, constitute the monumental tradition, so to speak, of the information we have about the values of the letters in classic and pre-classic and post-classic Greek words.

IV.

I now turn to say a few words about another source of information, the modern Greek language and its various dialects. If the Erasmianists, by the means at their disposal, which we have briefly enumerated, cannot succeed in gaining sufficient proof for their hypothesis, then they should listen to the few Hellenicists who say that, perhaps the present pronunciation is nearer to the old

classic than is that of Erasmus. I do not say that the Erasmianists should prepare themselves to become converts to all that Hellenicists assert; that would be too sad. But the testimony of scholars is to the fact that in such countries as in Greece languages go on for long, long periods without changing much. So that if any one were to begin with the present alphabets of Europe in order to cut his way back to classic times, he would be, it seems, more inclined to think that by starting from the modern Greek alphabet he could come more directly to the classic than by starting from the Latin or some one of its derivatives. Yet, it may be true that any one of the numerous alphabets which originated from the Greek, either directly or indirectly, may in some way increase our knowledge of the true state of the Greek alphabet at some given period in time past. So the Koptic in Egypt, the Russian in Moscow, the German in Munich, the French, the Roman—all, in so far as they are Greek alphabets by descent, may contribute something to our knowledge of the ancient Greek alphabet. But, however, all are more or less unlike the prototype. And which of all these is most like its original?

Although it always astonishes me to hear an advocate of the Erasmian method defend its almost absolute correctness, yet there is a certain pleasure in the fact; for, after all, the two pronunciations are not so antagonistic as might be supposed. To see that a pronunciation, based as is the Erasmian on the sounds that the letters still kept after passing through the Latin and the German, agrees, except in certain easily classified cases, with the other pronunciation which came down from ancient times in a more localized and, methinks, a more direct tradition, is a proof of how reliable a thing tradition is after all.

That the Erasmian is identical with the Sophoklean, I said, astonishes me to hear, but, nevertheless, it may be true. I am not, on the other hand, astonished to hear modern Greeks assert that their pronunciation also

comes from the ancient, because enthusiastic patriotic reasons might easily, under the circumstances, influence their judgment. I feel no obligation to believe either the one school or the other.

The Germans and the Greeks look at this matter from different points of view. The Greek has implanted in him from his first school days, as a second nature, his native alphabet. And in thinking about the alphabet of his ancestors he will always use his own contemporary native alphabet as the standard one to compare by. Likewise the German will use his Latin alphabet as his standard; for in the same way through his early school days has he come to feel the Latin alphabet as the key and base to all studies that deal in alphabets. Is it a wonder if Teuton and Greek when each travels back from separate starting places towards the goal of the ancient alphabet do not come out exactly together? Our sympathies are generally in this matter on the German side, because from them we learn our Comparative Philology, as from them we learn so many other things of science. Comparative Philology may show the proper relations between different alphabets, their relative values, their changes, etc. But when the absolute and independent value of each letter is required (a matter which is usually of not much importance) that depends much on what alphabet the student is to regard as basic for his comparisons. So, if we could for a moment imagine that the science of Comparative Philology was born and raised in Greece, its principles and methods might and should have been the same, but since the finders and users would then have had a different alphabet to start with, they would in certain details and absolute conclusions have differed from the German linguists. Then e. g. perhaps it would be the Greek alphabet that to all appearance was stable throughout the ages and the Latin that underwent more radical changes. In the genealogical tree of languages, perhaps then the modern Greek alphabet would be a more straight descendant from the Eukleidean letters than are the Latin and its offshoots.

For reasons stated, I am determined to think that the "Hellenic" is the best practical pronunciation for expressing the classic Greek language. And only on condition that it could be shown that we ought to pronounce all Greek as did Homer, and that Erasmus' pronunciation is the same as Homer's, or that we should pronounce as Sokrates, and that the pronunciation of Erasmus is that of Sokrates, and so on, will I cease to adhere to the "Hellenic" which I know to be a true Greek pronunciation, although I do not know how much it differs from the Homeric or the Sophoklean. The objection that this pronunciation is not in accord with Western practice is not weighty enough for me; the West is not accustomed to pronounce the language frequently in any way whatsoever. When we except the few professors that can and do read the language, we see that we are few against the several millions of people in the East who speak a Greek tongue and who would easily understand the Western professor if he were patient enough to practice a little, as he would have to do with his school-taught French after reaching Paris.

The assertion that the modern Greek on account of its numerous i-sounds is inharmonious would need to be proved. First, we must remember that the Erasmianists do not kill the i-sound in most of the diphthongs that the modern Greeks pronounce as i. Second, tables compiled by Rangabes and others show some interesting data concerning the frequency of the i-sound in various languages, data that will dispel all gloomy fears that the Hellenicists might have for their pronunciation on this score. Again, if they use the iota very much they resemble the old inhabitants of Attica, who, according to the testimony of Plato, εὖ μάλα ἐχρῶντο τῷ ιῶτᾳ.

After all very few men would dare to assert that they are aware that when they read Homer they might be mistaken for Plato doing the same thing. The modern Greek reads in his own way and the German in his; neither forgets his own peculiarities, and therefore the German's

Greek will have a Teutonic tinge and perhaps a deep one, while the Modern Greek's will have a Romaic coloring and that, perhaps, also deep.

In so far as the Erasmianists strive to discover the correct sounds of the Greek language at various times, their success is a deserving one. They need no defense, and although we, the Hellenicists, will strive to convert them to our practical notions of pronunciation, we will, when they teach us theory, continue to be their fervent pupils.

It is, perhaps, fair to think that if the pronunciation of Erasmus were not in vogue in the schools of the West it would not to-day find many men who would wish to introduce it or a similar system, although we are to-day better equipped than was Erasmus to know the true pronunciation in use in any given period of the life of the Greek language.

A strong believer in the righteousness of the cause of the Erasmianists told me lately that he did not, in practice, attempt to pronounce the φ, ς, and θ, as really *p+h*, *k+h*, *t+h*, but merely as *f*, *ch* (as in Ger. Ich) and *th* (as in thin). In this he agrees with most Erasmianists, but not with all. The principle he applies here, however, is ours; but we pronounce the other letters, as well as these three, according to the manner taught us by the Byzantine refugees. Again, I repeat, our Greek books are printed in the West in type which the Aldines and others had modeled from modern Greek manuscripts. These modern Greek letters are no more like the old letters of the inscriptions than are the modern Latin letters, and if, as the Erasmianists say, the Latin alphabet is more faithful to the original Greek than is the modern Romaic alphabet, then why not print all Greek books in this faithful Western Latin type? How many Erasmianists think of doing this? Yet, this measure would not now be near as radical as was the original measure of Erasmus.

Perhaps the method of Erasmus is correct, but per-

haps that of the Greeks is correct. Having to choose between the two uncertainties I prefer the pronunciation which is still to be heard as living voice from living tongue. The faith of the Erasmianists is surely a strong one and is bound up with pride of scholarship. Still they are searchers for the truth. We must await the completer studies of linguists before we can know the full value of modern Greek in this question of pronunciation. Of late, the best scholars are discovering that it is a mine worth working.

All of the above observations are founded on the most rigid conservatism, which we proclaim to be in all things our only principle. We will adhere to tradition till we know that tradition is misleading us.

DANIEL QUINN.

MARTYRS AND MARTYROLOGIES.

I.

By Acts of Martyrs we understand commonly the narrative of the sufferings and of the death of those among the Christians, who preferred to die rather than to deny their faith. They may be divided into two different classes. To the first class belong the Acts properly so-called, which are a copy of the verbal process written during the judicial trial of the martyr by one of the officials of the tribunal.

Copies of this official report were often given or sold by the employees of the court to the Christians, for whom they constituted a precious testimony of the victory of their heroes. In the Acts of Saints Tarachus, Probus, and companions, given by Ruinart, the writer says how he came into possession of those Acts, paying a large sum of money for their transcription. “*Quia omnia scripta confessionis eorum necesse erat nos colligere a quodam, nomine Sabasto, uno de spiculatoribus, ducentis denariis omnia ista transcripsimus.*”¹

As specimens of this class we may quote the Acts of St. Justin Martyr, given by Ruinart;² the “*Acta Pro consularia*” of St. Cyprian of Carthage;³ the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs;⁴ the Acts of Appollonius;⁵ and others. Besides these extremely precious documents, there is another series of martyrological narratives, which are not like the former ones, a judicial report, but simply recitals of what happened to the martyrs. This second class of Acts are properly called “*Passiones*” or “*Gesta Martyrum*.⁶”

¹Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum Sincera*. Ed. Ratisb. pag. 451.

²Ib., pag. 105.

³Ib., pag. 261.

⁴Ib., pag. 132.

⁵Conybeare, *Acts of Appollonius*, 1893, pag. 35.

They are again of various kinds. Some, indeed, are written by contemporary writers, perhaps by eye-witnesses of the facts which they relate; others were written much later, either from former sources or independently of them. To this class belong, for instance, the letter on the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp of Smyrna, written by the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philadelphia and all the other churches;¹ the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons on the Martyrs of Lyons of the year 177;² the "Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis";³ the Acts of SS. Nereus and Achilleus;⁴ and a number of others.

From the simple enunciation of the various classes of Acts, it is evident that not all of them enjoy an equal authority as to the facts which they relate. Those belonging to the first class, if they are found genuine and authentic, are absolutely trustworthy and above exception. They form the best class of Acts, because they are official records, or at least based on them. Unfortunately, the number of such pieces is extremely small. As to the second class, we have to distinguish. If those "Passiones" or "Gesta" were written by an eye-witness, or at least by contemporary authors, they have the same authority as other historical documents of the kind. Their trustworthiness is measured by the qualities of the author; his age, his knowledge, his sincerity, etc.

On the contrary, if these Acts were written after the events which they contain, their credit diminishes considerably; sometimes it is almost null. Still there is one thing to be considered. Let us suppose that certain Acts were written long time after the martyrdom of the saint; if we find out that they rely on contemporary sources they will have in our eyes just as much value as if they were written at the time of the martyrdom. The

¹Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 15. Funk. Opp. PP. Apost., vol I, pag. 282. Ruinart, pag. 77.

²Euseb. Hist. Eccl. V. 1. Ruinart, pag. 109.

³Greek text by Harris and Gifford, London, 1890; Latin by Ruinart, pag. 137.

⁴Latin text by Boll. Act SS. Mai., vol. III., pag. 6; Greek by Achelia, Texte und Untersuchungen, XI. 2.

rest of the Acts, which are written long after the facts of which they speak, can evidently not force our assent. This latter class is, however, the more numerous.

We need not be surprised to know that little esteem can be made of such Acts if we reflect that many of them go not farther back than the fifth or sixth century, when more or less all the details concerning the saint's martyrdom were effaced from the memories of the times. Already in the fifth or sixth century we find suspicions expressed as to certain Acts at least. The Church of Rome did not read them in her office, because the authors of them were unknown, and some were believed to be written by heretics.¹ However, it would be entirely wrong to throw away these Acts as altogether useless. They are in many cases valuable from other points of view. First, they present us generally a true and vivid picture of the religious customs, social life and institutions, of manners, and habits of the time in which they were written. Consequently, if we know the time of their origin, we are enabled to gain from them a knowledge of many usages prevailing then in human society. Secondly, if they are mistaken about the particular facts concerning either the personality of the martyrs or of their persecutors, they are generally exact in their *topographical* references. When speaking of monuments, tombs, etc., of the saints, they speak always with full knowledge of the local circumstances.

We can easily understand how this happens. The authors of such Acts wrote at a time when the monuments of the saints were yet intact, when they had not yet disappeared from the surface of the soil or were covered by walls in subterranean cemeteries. This good point of the ancient Acts has facilitated in part the arduous task of the great modern archaeologist, DeRossi. Starting from the topographical notions which he could gather from the Acts of Martyrs, from the Martyrologists, from the itineraries of pious pilgrims in the seventh, eighth,

¹Cf. *Decretum de recip. vel non recip. libris, Epp. RR. PP. ed. Thiel, vol. I, pag. 458.*

or ninth century, and from other hagiographical sources, he made often the most startling and unexpected discoveries. Moreover, it may happen that these Acts, however spurious and legendary they appear, contain a certain fund of historical truth interwoven with the imaginary account of the author. The latter may have had indeed a real, genuine, historical source from which he drew at his pleasure and built up his work on his own responsibility. It is here that criticism comes in, by which we separate the true from the false, the genuine from the spurious, the historical from the legendary. A French savant, Mr. Edmond LeBlant, for many years carried on the delicate work of re-examining the Acts of Martyrs to find out this fund of truth. His book on the Acts of Martyrs gives us the result of his studies.¹

II.

In connection with this we may enumerate some rules, assigned by the critics, by which they distinguish genuine Acts from false ones. First, the Proconsular Acts are as a general rule very short, because they contain only a short interrogatory of the martyr and his sentence to death. Second, the same Acts contain, mostly at the beginning, the date by consuls, as for instance in the Acts of St. Cyprian, which begin: "Imperatore Valeriano quartum et Gallieno tertium consulibus."² Third, the plainer and the simpler the style of certain Acts is the more reliable are the Acts. The primitive Christians in writing the triumphs of the martyrs had a particular gift of expressing everything in a natural, delicate way, not looking for any superfluous ornamentations.

Anybody must be struck by the differnce in style which exists between the Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, and any fifth century Acts. However, we must not believe that the absence of a miraculous or a supernatural element is a sign of genuineness. In the very

¹ Paris, 1803. Cf. Paul Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, vol. I, Introd., pag. XI.
²Ruinart, pag. 261.

ancient Acts we find often accounts of supernatural visions or miracles. The Acts just quoted are a striking example. Fourth, particular care must be taken in examining the historical data of the Acts, to see whether they correspond to the times to which they claim to belong. Thus, where names of emperors, consuls, and of other civil or military officials of the Roman Empire are mentioned, we must investigate, whether these men really lived at the times to which the Acts refer, or whether their offices were then designated by such names. Likewise the institutions of the Roman Empire, the laws, the geographical division, must be carefully compared with those which really existed at the time of the martyrdom. Almost invariably an author of false Acts is found to be either ignorant of the social and political conditions, or of the chronology of the times of which he writes; he generally speaks of them in terms which betray infallibly his own epoch. Fifth, Acts of a martyr, who is said to have suffered and died in a certain place, are generally not genuine if they lack what is called "local color;" namely, if the writer shows himself to be ignorant of the localities and monuments. He manifests thereby that he is not familiar with the topography of the place, and hence, that he did not write the Acts on the spot, but somewhere else, and only when he received knowledge of the facts from hearsay. Sixth, if in some Acts the martyr is supposed to speak on certain points of our Christian doctrine and to make thereon explanations or commentaries which suppose a later development of that same teaching, we are at once prompted to attribute these Acts to a later period. The reason is very plain. A man who speaks on doctrinal subjects reflects, as a rule, the thoughts of his epoch and employs such expressions as are current in his time. If, then, he speaks in terms which were used only when the question had reached a certain degree of development, it is by all means impossible to consider the piece to be as old as it claims to be.

III.

It may be asked now, how many real and genuine Acts we still possess. As already stated, they are, on the whole, not very numerous. I gave a certain number of them above when speaking of the various classes. Professor Adolf Harnack, of Berlin, exhibits a list of genuine Acts belonging to the first three centuries in his History of the Early Christian Literature.¹

A few words on the principal collections of the Acts of Martyrs will not be out of place. That the early Christians put a great interest in having the Acts of Martyrs is shown by the fact that they often bought them from the officials as well as by the solicitude in transmitting them to other churches. This does not mean, however, that they were collected everywhere through orders of the ecclesiastical authorities. The information which the author of the "Liber Pontificalis" gives us in the biographies of the popes—Clement I, (88–97), Anteros (235–236) and Fabian (236–250), who are said to have collected the Acts of Martyrs through certain notaries and subdeacons, placed over the seven districts of the city, seems to be less reliable and inserted by the author, to obtain a certain credit for the numerous "Gesta Martyrum" of his time.² Besides the account of Dionysius of Alexandria of the Martyrs of his city, and those of St. Cyprian in his letters, we have no collection of Acts of Martyrs until the time of the ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius of Cæsarea, who died 340. Two works written or compiled by him treat of this phase of Christian life. The first treats of the martyrs of Palestine, who suffered during the last persecution from 303 till 311. This small book is generally published with his ecclesiastical history. Besides it Eusebius mentions frequently another compila-

¹Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand der alchristlichen Literatur bis auf Eusebius. Part I., Vol. 2, page 816.

²Lib. Pont. ed Duchesne, vol. I, pp. 123, 147, 148, and Introd. pag. VI.

tion, which he calls : “*Ἀρχαῖων Μαρτυρίων Συναγωγή.*”¹ This precious work of Christian literature is lost, to the detriment and sorrow of the student of Christian antiquity. Among the writers of the Latin Church we may quote Aurelius Prudentius, who in his “*Peristephanon*” sang the triumph of a number of martyrs,² and Gregory of Tours, who celebrated their miracles in his “*Gloria Martyrum.*”³ These two works of the Occidental writers can not claim the merit of the writings of Eusebius, who had at his disposal almost the entire material of genuine and sincere Acts. Coming to our modern times, we have various compilations of Acts of Martyrs. In 1497 Boninus Membritius published his “*Sanctuarium sive Vitæ Sanctorum;*” towards 1570 Laurentius Surius published the Lives of the Saints according to the order in the Calendar. The most complete compilation of this kind is the “*Acta Sanctorum Bollandi,*” begun in the seventeenth century and still continued in our days. At present it reaches to the beginning of November. As a supplement there appear in Brussels the “*Analecta Bollandiana,*” edited by the same society of the Bollandists. A selection of ancient and genuine Acts was made by the French Benedictine scholar, Thierry Ruinart, and published the first time in 1669, with the title of “*Acta Primorum Martyrum sincera et selecta.*” They were oftentimes reprinted, the last time in 1859, at Ratisbon. The great scholar has evidently taken much pain in severing from his edition everything that was spurious or even doubtful. Still, according to the judgment of critics in our days, several documents must yet be expunged.

IV.

A Martyrology is nothing else but a list of names of saints arranged according to the order of the days of the

¹Hist. Eccl. IV, 15; V, 4.

²Patrol. Lat. ed. Migne, vol. LX.

³Migne, P. L., vol. LXXI.

years.¹ The reason of having these lists is very clear. From the earliest times of Christianity the followers of the new religion used to celebrate every year the anniversary of their saints, whose ranks were then filled from the martyrs alone. The day selected was the day of their martyrdom, the "Dies Natalis," or birthday, as the Christians used to call it. They thought, indeed, that the real birthday of a Christian was not the day in which he first saw the light of this world, but the day in which he was born to a new, happier, and everlasting life. We find a mention of this practice already in the letter of the Christians of Smyrna, when relating the martyrdom of St. Polycarp: "Quo loci nobis præbebit Dominus natalem martyri ejus diem celebrare."²

In order to keep exact record of these anniversaries, they wrote them down on a list which they increased as time went on and new confessors died for their faith. To this custom seem to allude the words of Tertullian addressed to a Christian: "Habes tuos census, tuos fastos."³ In some places the bishops recommended to their clergy to take good care in registering the days in which the martyrs died to celebrate afterwards their memory on their anniversaries. So, for instance, St. Cyprian in his letter to his clergy writes in the following terms: "Dies eorum, quibus excedunt, adnotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus."⁴

In this way the so-called calendars of saints were formed. Very likely at the beginning each church had

¹ On the subject of the Martyrologies one may even yet consult with profit Baronius' preface to the Roman Martyrology, the first volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*, the work of Fiorentini, the preface of Ruinart to his "Acta Martyrum Sincera," and the dissertations of Zaccaria, Gerbert, Fabricius, and Pelliccia among the earlier writers. De Rossi in the second volume of "Roma Sotterranea," Kraus in the second volume of the *Realencyclopädie*, Grisar in the *Civilità Cattolica* (Serie XV, vol. VI, 1893) and Laemmer in his *Parergon Historico Criticum* bring the questions down to the present time. Baeumer's History of the Breviary and Thalhofer's Manual of Liturgy are worth consultation. The oldest (Syriac) Martyrology has been made the subject of valuable treatises by Wright, *An Ancient Syriac Martyrology*, London, 1866, and by Egil (*Altchristliche Studien*, 1887). In the *Historisch Politische Blätter* (116⁷, 1895) Father Veith, O. S. B., began a series of articles on the Ecclesiastical Martyrologies. See also Le Blant, "Les Actes des Martyrs," Paris, 1882.

² Ruinart, pag. 89, 90.

³ De Coron, P. L., Vol. II, page 96.

⁴ Ep. 37, P. L. Vol. IV, page 337.

her own calendar, where only the local saints were registered. The most ancient calendars, which have come down to us, are those of Rome, of Tours, and of Carthage. The Calendar of Rome is exhibited in two lists, which are entitled: "Depositiones Episcoporum" and "Depositiones Martyrum." They were ultimately completed towards the year 354. Published first by the Jesuit Bucherius in 1634, they were re-edited by Mommsen in 1850 under the title of "Ueber den Roemischen Chronographen vom Jahre 354." They are also given in the "Acta Martyrum" of Ruinart (p. 631, ed. Ratisb.). The Calendar of Tours has been preserved by Gregory, bishop of that city, in his "Historia Francorum;" it contains only the more solemn feastdays during the year, and was established by the bishop Perpetuus (460-490).¹ Finally the Calendar of Carthage was not published before the year 505. It was first edited by Mabillon, then again by Ruinart in his "Acta Martyrum."² An extension of these calendars is what we call the Martyrologies. They were usually formed by combining several calendars. As they contained only a few and local saints, the Martyrologies became a sort of universal calendars. The most ancient and important of them is the so-called "Martyrologium Hieronymianum." It has received this name because its compiler claims to be the great ecclesiastical writer, St. Jerome. Its origin goes back to the latter half of the fifth century, and it was written probably in Northern Italy, probably at Rome. Towards the end of the sixth century it was revised and enlarged by a cleric of the Church of Auxerre in France, who added all the particular feastdays of Gaul, chiefly of his own church.

The sources from which the compilation is formed are chiefly three: First, an ancient Roman calendar which resembles greatly the Roman calendar already spoken of. The one inserted in the martyrology is increased and enlarged. Second, a Greek or Oriental Martyrology ex-

¹ cf. Duchesne, *Origines du culte Chrétien*, page 279.

² Duchesne, ib.—Ruinart, page 632.

ecuted at Nicomedia, very likely short time after the year 362, of which there exists still an abbreviation, written about the year 411 or 412. Third, various lists of African Martyrs. Besides these principal sources the author had at hand also informations about the saints of Italy at large, Spain, Gaul, etc.¹ From this Martyrology of St. Jerome derive all the other Martyrologies of the later Middle Ages, as for instance, the "Martyrologium Romanum Parvum," written about the year 700; the "Martyrologium Bedae," written about the same time; the "Martyrologium Adonis Viennensis," written about 850; and that of Usuardus, written towards the year 875.² The only difference between these Martyrologies and that of the pseudo-Jerome is, that they contain a short historical notice of the saints taken from their Acts, while the latter has barely the name of the saint and of the place of their martyrdom or their tomb. Our present Roman Martyrology is only an enlarged edition of this last one prepared in the sixteenth century by Cardinal Baronius, and edited the first time in Rome in 1589.

FRANCIS SCHAEFER.

St. Paul's Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

¹Cf. Duchesne, *Les sources du Martyrologe Hiéronymien*, in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d' Histoire*, 1885, pp. 115-160. De Rossi and Duchesne, *Martyrologium Hieronymi*, in the *Acta SS.*, Nov. tom. II., Brussels, 1894. Shaham, on the same, *CATH. UNIVERSITY BULLETIN*, Jan., 1895, p. 115.

²They may be found respectively in Migne, P. L. vol. CXXIII., p. 146; XCIV., p. 799; CXXIII., p. 206; CXXIII., p. 599, and vol. CXXIV.

THE STUDY OF HIGHER MATHEMATICS.

The idea commonly entertained about mathematics by those who have never given special and persevering attention to the subject—and such, of course, are still the great majority, even of the well educated—seems to be that the science is mainly, if not entirely, occupied with the solution of individual problems, and these practically all of a numerical character; that it is, in short, after all, a somewhat extended form of what is usually understood as arithmetic. And though this idea is to mathematicians rather a provoking one, it cannot altogether be wondered at, as the majority mentioned who entertain this idea, have in the mathematical studies which they have made, found them to be, apparently, principally concerned with matters of this kind. One has only to open the pages of any ordinary algebra to find for what would seem to be the last outcome of the science there explained, problems something like the following: “The fore-wheel of a carriage makes 15 more revolutions than the hind-wheel in going 180 yards; but if the circumference of each wheel was increased by 3 feet, the fore-wheel would make only 9 more revolutions than the hind-wheel in the same distance. Find the circumference of each wheel.”

Attention need not, perhaps, to be especially called to the absurdity and inanity in themselves of problems like the above, which it is very evident could not possibly occur in practice. In any actual carriage, if one wanted to find the circumference of each wheel, the practical way would be to get a tape and measure it; and it would certainly be very difficult to increase each wheel’s circumference by 3 feet, even if such a method were considered best for arriving at an accurate result. But that is not the fundamental error in the idea given by such problems,

though it is quite enough to disgust the prosaic as well as the poetic mind with the whole subject. The fundamental and important error is that mathematical science is mainly occupied with finding the value of some "unknown" quantity, which quantity is, however, perfectly definite and determinate when we once get at it. This notion continually crops out in all allusions to the subject outside of those made by actual mathematicians. And though the ordinary geometry, which almost every one who goes beyond the three R's knows something about, is evidently occupied with general relations between quantities all unknown and essentially indefinite, still its whole scope and purpose is conceived to be, after all, merely the obtaining of a means to the end of getting some numerical and definite result, as the area of a plot of ground, or the position of a ship at sea. The value of " x "; that is supposed to be the whole thing that mathematicians are worrying about.

Let it not, however, be supposed that we are finding fault with the presentation of algebra or mathematical science in general, given in the ordinary text-books. Though some improvement might, perhaps, be here and there introduced to give a foreshadowing of the regions beyond, problems like the above seem to be unavoidable as the principal matters on which beginners are to exercise themselves and to acquire familiarity with the tools with which they will, if they persevere, work later on.

But that "later on" seldom comes. Though the true idea and the real fascination of the study may be perceived by those having special ability for the subject sooner, it hardly comes out prominently till one enters on the conceptions which form the basis of the differential and integral calculus. Here it may be said that the higher mathematics begin; but most of those even who get as far as this, partly because they are tired by the dry and seemingly profitless nature of most of what has gone before, and partly because what they are now taking up seems vague, shadowy, and uncertain, become dis-

couraged here, and conclude that mathematical science is either a matter of dry figuring, for which some people unaccountably have a taste, or that it is a sort of speculation in a very limited field, in which they have no interest, and which requires some very out-of-the-way and we may say abnormal cast of mind.

Let us first see if there is any very traceable connection between a taste for and proficiency in the higher mathematics, and accuracy and quickness in arithmetical computation. Probably most persons would take for granted that there is, of course, such a connection; but strange as it may seem, it is actually found that some if not most of the most distinguished mathematicians are found to be very poor computers, indeed hardly proficient in adding up an ordinary column of figures. In some cases this may be due to want of practice; for in most mathematical investigations the arithmetic is only seldom required, and when it does come in it is usually of a very elementary character. But it is not always so; some in their work do have occasion frequently to apply their results to particular and complicated cases, and even in the development of some abstract investigations a good deal of arithmetical work may occasionally be needed. But even in such cases it does not usually appear that the practised mathematician is on the average much better than the ordinary well instructed school-boy. Neither does it appear that the extraordinary arithmetical geniuses, whose work is done with phenomenal quickness and accuracy, necessarily care much about mathematical investigation, or distinguish themselves in it. The probability really seems to be that the mathematician is not more likely, unless practice may have forced him to it, to be good at figures, or to enjoy working with them, than the jurist, the philosopher, or the theologian. Some even think that arithmetical quickness and precision are rather a bad sign in a mathematical student, though they cannot deny that there are some and very notable exceptions to such a rule.

Let us next consider if the idea is correct that the field of mathematics is a very limited one, so that students may safely put it aside and say to themselves that most matters, indeed almost all, can be thoroughly understood and reasoned about and thoroughly explored and appreciated without any employment of mathematical reasoning.

In the first place, it is plain that mathematical reasoning applies to every subject in which quantity is concerned. It does not apply in what may be called the strict, or at any rate in this quantitative sense, to many of the matters with which philosophy or theology have to deal. The mind, its operations, and the qualities which can be attributed to it are not subject to anything which can properly be called mathematical measurement. One cannot attach a real meaning to the statement that one person is twice as good or as intelligent as another; and the infinity of the Divine perfection is not merely beyond mathematical conception or measurement, but altogether outside of it. That which cannot be increased is not a mathematical quantity.

There are then many subjects to the investigation of which our minds may be most worthily applied which are outside of the range of quantitative or mathematical reasoning; but still mathematics may have its application even in matters connected with or forming a part of theology or philosophy. Its perfect and complete application, however, is to the material universe, and the conditions of space and time under which that universe exists.

And here its use and the extent to which it can be carried is much greater than perhaps is generally supposed. Every branch of physical science as it progresses needs mathematical science more and more. At first it is mainly a matter of observation and experiment, for the discussion of which a little arithmetical work may suffice; as it advances and its laws become better known those laws approach more and more to a mathematical form,

and become more and more incomprehensible without a knowledge of what is known as the higher mathematics.

Nor is it too much to say that all the beauty and harmony which our senses can and do recognize in the material universe are probably a matter of mathematics. Those who have but a slight acquaintance with the science usually seems to imagine that as far as it relates to external form it is all concerned with straight lines and angles ; it would be just as correct to suppose that the beauties of literature, the charm of poetry or eloquence are all developed in a child's spelling-book. Both mathematical and literary studies begin with these elements, because they are the simplest ; but the attraction and enjoyment is not in them, but in what lies beyond. It is strange that it should be imagined that the mathematician is so fond of hard facts and figures that the beauties of nature or art give him no gratification, when no one imagines that the musician ceases to care for harmony because he studies in what that harmony consists and what its laws are. Musical harmony is in fact a matter of comparatively simple mathematics, for the most part, and it would seem that melody may probably belong to the same science as well ; if so, why should it not be enjoyed if its laws were known, or least by those who best knew them ? It would be but one step farther in the same direction, though of course an incomparably greater one, to say that the Creator of the universe, because His knowledge of it is full and complete, can see no beauty in what He has made. The more we understand the works of creation the better we shall enjoy them, and to understand them thoroughly without mathematics is not possible.

There is not, and there cannot be, any incongruity between a taste for and a study of mathematics and the esthetic or artistic sense. Still it is true that mathematicians are often inattentive to many things in nature which attract and please others, and show little interest in some even of the natural sciences. There is no doubt that they are often, and perhaps usually, so engrossed

and absorbed in their own studies that they are not inclined to pay much attention to matters to which those studies cannot as yet be very thoroughly applied. But this is not because mathematics has only a very limited domain possible to it, but because its full domain has not yet been opened up, or because these other matters have not as yet been studied enough to make it possible to examine their higher and more intellectual perfections by its means.

Probably the reason for the general impression that mathematical study has a very limited field is that there seems to be so few that have a decided ability for it. But the idea that there are few who have such ability is almost certainly an erroneous one. If ability for mathematics were really, as most people suppose, the same as quickness at arithmetical calculation, it might indeed be true. But in fact this ability seems to be indistinguishable from that for reasoning in general. Mathematical ability is simply logical ability; the chains of deduction are longer certainly than in the reasoning we generally have occasion to use, but that is only because the matters are simpler than most of those which come under our consideration and more easy to apply logic to. There is probably hardly a mathematician in the world who is not fully convinced that any able thinker or careful and correct reasoner could have become thoroughly proficient in mathematics if he had had the perseverance to go far enough to find out what mathematics really is. Mathematical ability is not something so special and exceptional. Perhaps the best proof of this is that it is often, as if it were accidentally, developed in those who have had in early life no fondness for its rudiments, and many mathematicians have at the point where, as has been said, so many drop it almost done the same, and have been got over this critical point by some outside cause which impelled them to the exertion required to become familiar with the new ideas then presented to the mind.

But it would also be a mistake to suppose that mathe-

matical ability, at any rate when it can be called genius, is simply the power to follow a chain of reasoning. Though the labor-saving processes of modern analysis may by almost unavoidable sequence sometimes lead to new results, still an intuitive power which sees those results before they can be legitimately and clearly deduced is also needed more or less in original work, and those who have advanced the science have seldom or never been without this power, which seems to be as truly an inspiration as that which is needed for the real poet or artist. The idea, the foreshadowing of the general law which his analysis will afterward securely establish, must be in his mind before he can direct his work toward it almost as certainly as the conception of the picture must be in that of the painter before he takes his brush in hand. Neither one is likely to succeed by mere accident.

What has been said may perhaps not be very convincing to people in general; the impression that mathematics, unless we call mere arithmetical figuring of the ordinary kind by that name, is a specialty, of quite limited application or usefulness, is a very strong one. But one fact at any rate is evident to those who are studying what are usually considered now as quite interesting and important branches of research, such as the social sciences; namely, that the reasoning required in them is becoming more mathematical in its character, so that for their successful prosecution it is becoming more and more desirable to have a familiarity with the calculus, and perhaps with even the more recent developments of mathematical science; so that men of ability who have previously supposed that the subjects in which they were interested lay quite outside the province of the sort of mathematics which they knew was needed for the more advanced physical studies are now seeing their need for it.

It is becoming continually more clear that mathematical study is not merely useful as a mental exercise, to form habits of patient and accurate thought, but that the very matters of which it treats, and the results which

M. J. O.

have been attained in it are even now and will be increasingly needed in a very great proportion of all the subjects on which thought can be worthily bestowed. And it would seem to follow from this that more time should be given than has been generally thought worth while by students in their early days to a study which has so many and so important applications. It is not necessary that they should master the whole of it, still less that they should advance in it far enough to make original research in it; the former task will soon be, if it is not already, something beyond the power of any one individual, and the latter is not likely to be accomplished by any one who does not make it the principal occupation of his mind; and that sort of devotion to the study of so absorbing a science is likely to prevent the acquisition of other matters which it is in general more desirable to know.

But students of good general ability should not turn away, as they so often do, when they encounter the difficulties which are likely to occur, as has been said, at the point where mathematical study passes from the solution of particular problems involving fixed and definite quantities to the study of the laws connecting variable and seemingly vague ones. There is little doubt that when these initial difficulties have been overcome by a little persevering thought and attention, the subject will to most minds, especially those of a logical cast, but also very probably to all which appreciate beauty, harmony, and order in their higher forms, be incomparably more interesting than it has been before. In fact the special problems and puzzles which are commonly supposed to be the mathematician's joy and recreation, and which are often brought to him seemingly as rare tid-bits, have less attraction for those who have crossed the Rubicon of which we have been speaking than they have even for the world in general.

It is in the aspect of a pure science, and one interwoven with and necessary to so many other sciences, that mathematics should be principally considered in univer-

sity teaching. Still it is not below the scope of a properly postgraduate instruction to consider those higher applications of the science which are now necessary to be understood by those who wish to take anything more than a merely subordinate place in those practical walks of life, such as engineering in its various forms, with which it is so largely concerned. It is for the sake of such practical objects and pursuits and on account of its mechanical applications and uses that it will be, probably for a considerable time to come, principally followed. But it is to be hoped that the number of those who will value it for its own sake will increase, at any rate as much with us as it has in other countries; that its connection with all that concerns the visible world may be more realized, and especially that it may not be considered as a matter which only a peculiarly constituted few can be interested in, but as coming within the comprehension and worthy of the attention of the majority of thoughtful minds.

GEORGE M. SEARLE.

CARDINAL VON GEISSEL.—I.

“Quantum refert, in quae tempora optimi cuiusque virtus inciderit!” This was the motto of the life and the reign of Pope Hadrian VI. († 1523); they still mark the slab over his last resting place in the church of his German compatriots, Santa Maria Dell’Anima at Rome. Even at this moment do they recur to our mind when we are about to write a succinct extract from the life and works of an eminent prince of the Church, Cardinal von Geissel, who will forever remain one of the greatest glories of the Church in Germany and of the episcopate of the nineteenth century.

The motto, however, does not apply in the same sense to both men. Hadrian, a former professor of Louvain, endowed with the highest quality of heart and mind, yet reflecting the serious character and simplicity of life of a Celestine V., felt uneasy amid the extraordinary grandeur which his immediate predecessor, Leo X., the illustrious descendant of the Medici, had introduced into the metropolis of Christendom. Moreover, the waves of rebellion excited by the monk of Wittenberg surrounded and threatened to engulf the bark of Peter, in spite of the good intentions of Hadrian, who saw his best efforts frustrated. No wonder that he succumbed under the weight of such an onslaught, and in the supreme moment of his life, when after a short pontificate of one year’s duration he was about to render his soul to its Maker, he repeated in accents of the deepest grief: “*Proh dolor, quantum refert, in quae tempora optimi cuiusque virtus inciderit!*”

I.

Surely no one will think us guilty of exaggeration when we say that seldom during the course of centuries has a prince of the Church been called to the charge of his flock under such critical circumstances as was the late

Cardinal Geissel, who died as archbishop of Cologne in 1864. He was called to a position of honor and combat in one of the largest dioceses of the world at a moment when no one dreamed of his nomination and when, humanly speaking, nothing could warrant the prospects of his election. He entered the ancient metropolis on the borders of the Rhine, a total stranger to the inhabitants, at a time when the faith-inspired respect for the episcopal dignity could alone open to him the portals of his cathedral. He had been called to heal wounds which seemed incurable, to level difficulties which appeared insurmountable. Obedience alone to the Holy See, and no other motive, could have determined Bishop Geissel to assume such a burden, and more than once did the "Proh dolor!" pass his lips before his final departure for Cologne as well as during the first years of his episcopate; but today, at the first centenary anniversary of his birth, the same people, rich as they are in great reminiscences and justly jealous of glorious traditions, preserve an affectionate souvenir of this "stranger," this "intruder," and with legitimate pride do they place him in the first ranks of the long line of their pontiffs. *Tantum refert in quae tempora optimi cuinsque virtus inciderit!*

Several biographers have already consecrated their pen to the description of the animated and prolific career of our Cardinal. Rev. Dr. Dumont, his devoted secretary, who is at present a prominent canon of the Cologne Cathedral, has collected in several volumes the principal documents which give us a glimpse of the prodigious activity of von Geissel and the decided influence which he exercised over the events of his age and country. But the natural born historian who could so write his life as to show posterity the striking grandeur of his noble character, was still wanting. This gap is now filled. Father Otto Pfuelf, S. J., who in several other works has exhibited the qualifications of a true historian, has written two magnificent volumes, which are a monument to the memory of the Cardinal, and which will find a place among the most

valuable historiographical works of our day.¹ Although composed, as the title indicates, from the private letters and manuscripts left by the deceased, this work contains no trace of that mean and narrow spirit which, instead of judging great men by their chef d'œuvre, rather seeks to belittle the grandeur of their deeds by pointing out the little deficiencies, like the self-styled impartial critic, whose principal aim is to discover the cobwebs among the splendid arches of the imposing Cathedral of Cologne. All who have the sense of decency and the love of truth will find a true consolation in reading the beautiful pages dedicated to the memory of Cardinal Geissel, after having perused the literary crime committed on the great personality of Cardinal Manning in a work which a Protestant critic styles, "not only a bad book, but a bad action."²

Father Pfuel, in these two volumes, displays well the precious art of reproducing personages and happenings before the eyes of the reader, and proves himself a safe and experienced guide through a series of the most diverse and complicated events, in which his hero has been called by Divine Providence to play the predominant role. In depicting the striking figure of a man who, like von Geissel, was for more than twenty years the soul of all Catholic movements in Germany, the biographer can not well succeed unless he thoroughly understands the drama in which the Cardinal was the principal actor. He must, moreover, be able to assign to each character in the scene his respective place, an art which is all the more delicate when these persons occupy the highest rank in the ecclesiastical and social hierarchy. Father Pfuel has completed this task with rare felicity. His own personality disappears in presence of the events which he relates. He pictures the Cardinal, for the most part in his own words, by citing his letters and writings; he habitually reproduces for the reader those historical documents which

¹Cardinal von Geissel, aus seinem handschriftlichen Nachlass geschildert, von Otto Pfuel, S. J. Herdersche Verlagshandlung. Freiburg i. Breisgau, 2 vols., 8°, 1895.

²"Ce livre n'est pas seulement un mauvais livre, c'est une mauvaise action." Fr. de Présensé, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May, 1896.

reflect the most salient points, and withal proves himself the pragmatical historian, who brings to light the sublime lessons furnished in the biography of a man to whom the Church in Germany is indebted for the glorious position she has occupied from the time of his accession to the principal archdiocese of the country.

I shall never forget the profound impression made upon me by the announcement of the death of him whom, not alone the diocese of Cologne, but the whole of Germany called "*the Cardinal*." When one day in my youth a good mother piously folding her hands, and casting a look of sorrowful resignation toward heaven, explained to me the cause of the funeral notes which sounded from every bell in our diocese, by simply repeating: "the Cardinal is dead," I was penetrated by a feeling that death had sought out a victim on the heights of humanity, whose demise had sent a simultaneous shock through every class and sphere of society. Only once in my youth have I enjoyed the privilege of seeing this pontiff, whose every outward expression reflected the loftiness of his dignity and personal qualities. This impression, continually recalled and enhanced by the veneration with which I heard Catholic parents and teachers pronounce his name, has indelibly engraved his memory and his image in my soul. The Cardinal was, in my eyes, the representative of the highest ecclesiastical authority and dignity, the perfect and concrete expression of priestly power, virtue, and wisdom; the personal incorporation of the genius of the Catholic religion. Mature age has, indeed, enlightened these impressions of youth, but in no other wise has it altered them. On the contrary, thanks to the beautiful work of Father Pfuel, they are revived in all their freshness and with all their charms. He has taught me anew and in a manner as alluring as it is convincing, that the judgment which the faithful flock formed of their venerable pastor, is, and shall always be, that of history.

But let me hasten to give my readers something more than my own personal impressions and appreciations. I

will let history speak and try to sketch in a few rapid strokes some outline of the history of the Church in Germany in the first half of this century, especially the situation before the advent of Bishop Geissel, and then show in a cursory view the happy influence he exercised.¹

II.

The ancient city of Cologne may well be proud of having during the Reformation remained true to her traditional title: "Sancta Colonia, Romae semper fidelis filia." Still the hypocrisy of Jansenism or Gallicanism, which became Josephinism under the "Sacristan Emperor," Joseph II, left its profound imprint in the Rhenish provinces among some of the clergy, not excluding several members of the episcopate. It will suffice to mention here the names of Febronius (Nicolaus Hontheim), who was auxiliary bishop of Treves (1790); of Wessenberg, a vile flatterer of the civil authority, who was the protégé and vicar-general of Mgr. Dalberg, bishop of Mayence (1800); of Weishaupt, a freemason in priestly garb, founder of the secret society of the "Illuminati" (1776); of Maximilian Joseph, brother of Joseph II, archbishop of Cologne, who with his colleagues, the spiritual electors of Treves and Mayence, formulated the infamous "twenty-three articles," known as the "Punctuation of Ems" (1786), the object of which was to make the archbishops practically independent of the Holy See. The French Revolution overflowing like a torrent the confines of France, exercised a most disastrous influence over that part of Rhenish Germany which then became a French "department." This influence tended to secularize the spirit as well as the possessions of the seminaries and all educational institutions in general. In many dioceses the election of bishops was impeded. Civil authority hindered or influenced the election of professors, canons, and pastors. After the death of Bishop Maximilian Joseph (1801), who was more of an archduke than archbishop, the see of Cologne remained vacant until 1824. Napoleon I, the "protector of

¹In a future number of the BULLETIN will be described the Cardinal's career in Cologne.

the Rheinbund," to the great joy of Protestant princes, paralyzed all efforts of Rome to reorganize the dioceses of Germany, and herein he found an able and servile assistant in Dalberg, archbishop of Mayence. The ruler who was wont to say that "politics have no heart but only a head," too well knew that religious decadence favored the downfall of the ancient Roman Empire more than did the treason of the princes. The hopes which Catholics placed in the Congress of Vienna (1815) were never realized. The diplomats caring only to secure their share of the spoils turned a deaf ear to the just claims of the Church.

III.

This same Congress, however, brought about decided changes for the Rhenish territory. The dioceses of Cologne and Treves from now on became a part of the Kingdom of Prussia. The consequences of this radical change were no less decisive for religion than for politics. The King of Prussia, Frederick William III., possessed a well-known aversion, not to say hatred, for Catholicism. Believing the "Prussian law" to be "the source of all religious and political rights of his subjects,"¹ he never missed an occasion to let the clergy feel his "Jus episcopale," and by every means to fetter that Catholic liberty which he thought it his duty to restrict if he might not destroy. The Rhenish provinces were literally flooded with Protestant employés from the "North," and these were expected and directly encouraged to spread the propaganda of Protestantism especially by means of "mixed marriages." This iron-bound bureaucracy felt no scruples in silencing the complaints of revolting conscience. All schools were declared to be under the exclusive domain of the state; even the professors of Catholic theology at the University of Bonn could not be appointed without the consent of the state. Every uncatholic movement within the church was fostered by the state authority—for instance, the heresy of George Hermes, professor in Münster, and later

¹See the declaration of Schmedding, private counselor of the King; Pfuel, I.

in Bonn (†1831); the kindred school of Günther, professor in Vienna (since 1828), represented in Prussia especially at the University of Breslau, and the ridiculous efforts of the apostate Ronge (1844) to establish the so-called "German-Catholic Church." In order to appease the people, the Bull "De salute animarum" (1821) was accepted by the government as a statute binding on Catholics, in which the chapters were given the right of presenting to the King the names of three candidates for each vacant bishopric, but the King could exclude the names of the "personae minus gratae." The first archbishop of Cologne, who was elected under the new rules, was Count August von Spiegel (1825-1835); a "persona gratissima" to the court. Trusting his "friendly dispositions" and "conciliatory tendencies" the government extended (1825) the law promulgated in Silesia (1803) to the Catholic provinces of the Rhine and Westphalia, by virtue of which the children of mixed marriages were to adopt the religion of the father. Pope Pius VIII (in his Brief of March 25, 1830,) upheld the discipline of the Church, and forbade mixed marriages in case the contracting parties did not promise to bring up as Catholics the children of both sexes; but he at the same time permitted the pastor to be "passively present" at marriages contracted without such a promise and declared them valid even when the decrees of the Council of Trent were not observed.

Josias von Bunsen, Prussian ambassador at Rome and well known there as the most cunning of all intriguers with whom the Curia had ever dealt,¹ induced Archbishop Spiegel to conclude a "*secret convention*" with the government (1834), by which the Catholic educational clause was sacrificed and the brief of the Pope "interpreted" in the sense of the King's regulation of 1825. The bishops of Münster and Paderborn were deceived by the same means. The government controlled the instruc-

¹Since that time the verb "bunsare" meant in Rome the nec plus ultra of dishonesty and knavery.

tions given to the clergy and menaced with exile all those who refused their obedience. It flattered itself with the hope that the successor of Spiegel, Clemens August de Droste Vischering (elected 1835), might be animated with the same "conciliatory spirit." It expected that the name of a von Droste, which in Germany is a synonym for chivalric virtue and strong attachment to the Catholic faith, would contribute much towards "pacifying" the people, among whom this very law, so evidently treacherous and anti-Catholic, had excited indignation and revived that well-known anti-Prussian spirit, the consequences of which Frederic William had himself good reason to fear. This time, however, they had not to deal with a mercenary, but with a veritable pastor of souls. No King by his menacing could cause this *rocher de bronze* to quiver; no Bunsen was sufficiently cunning to deceive this noble and upright heart; no promise could entice this true apostle to deviate one iota from the line of conduct marked out for him by his faith and his conscience. The Hermesian professors of "Catholic" theology in Bonn¹—a rationalistic theology which dries up the soul, enervates clerical enthusiasm, and emasculates Christian faith and worship—had quite a following among the clergy, particularly in the chapter; moreover, they had powerful protectors at Berlin. Yet the new bishops rejected their Jansenistic distinction between "right and fact" as to the infallible character of a final papal decision, and repudiating their "silentium obsequiosum," caused them to feel the full force of the condemnatory decrees of Gregory XVI., dated September 26, 1835, and January 7, 1836. The government would have readily pardoned this exhibition of zeal for orthodoxy had Clemens August been less strict in regard to the question of mixed marriages. The "liberal" canons were disturbed; certain "State-Catholics" became unsparing advocates of a "conciliatory attitude;" the emissaries of the govern-

¹They were four—Scholz, Achterfeldt, Braun, Vogelsang—composing at that time the whole faculty.

ment added all their cunning and falsehood. Yet the archbishop firmly, clearly, and solemnly repeated the "non possumus" of the Apostle. Soon after he entered the prison of Minden (Westphalia) between two gendarmes, his head erect and the joy of the victims of Christ in his heart.

It would be difficult to form a correct idea of the effect produced by this noble attitude of the courageous Pontiff. Catholic feeling, so long dormant under the influence of such frailty and the numerous degrading compromises, or bridled by the action of a cunning and tyrannical bureaucracy, now suddenly manifested itself in every quarter as if by one veritable explosion. Unfortunately, the faithful, at the beginning of this century, were no longer accustomed to leaders like Athanasius and Chrysostom; yet their innermost conscience made them feel that such men were necessary at this day, as well as at the time of crowned persecutors like Arcadius and Constantius, and traitors in the Episcopal purple like Theophilus and Eusebius. At the action of the Archbishop this feeling burst forth, and in every hamlet in the land was heard the joyful cry: *Habemus Pontificem!* We have at last found a veritable pastor! In the churches, where the multitude assembled to offer prayers for the august captive, these often ended in the spontaneous chant of the majestic *Te Deum* in German: "Grosser Gott, wir loben dich," while on the banks of the Rhine and the Mosel were caught up the echoes of the words of the royal prophet: *Dirupisti, Domine, vincula nostra!* This was a time of consolation for the diocese of Cologne, for Germany at large, and, I dare say, for the whole Catholic world. This is evidenced by the incredible effect produced by the "*Athanasius*," a book written with the fiery flames of Catholic enthusiasm, rather than with ink and pen, by the incomparable Goerres; by the expressions of sympathetic admiration received by the illustrious prisoner from all parts of Europe; by the admirable letter sent to the confessors of the faith in Prussia by our bishops assembled in the first

Plenary Council of Baltimore;¹ by the magnificent scene which occurred in the Vatican, when Gregory XVI. received with honors accorded only to sovereigns the bishop martyr, of whom he had said in a memorable allocution that he had become "spectaculum angelis et hominibus!"

IV.

But we must turn away from this consoling spectacle. It certainly was a striking manifestation of the inexhaustible life which the Holy Ghost bestows on the body of the Church which he animates. We might already conclude therefrom that by the actions of a people so strongly attached to the faith the Catholic Church in that country will soon enjoy better days.

¹Our readers will doubtless be pleased to read the full text of this letter, written in a truly apostolic style and spirit by our fathers in the faith, and breathing the most fervent affection for their persecuted brethren. The letter is also addressed to the Archbishop of Posen, Martin von Dunin, likewise an object of the persecution of the Prussian government. It reads as follows:

Epistola Patrum Synodi ad Coloniensem, et Posnaniensem ac Gnesensem Archiepiscopos.

Venerabilibus in Christo Fratribus, inclytisque Fidei confessoribus Clementi Augusto ex liberis Baronibus De Drosti ex Vischering, Coloniensi, et Martino a Dunini Posnaniensi, et Gnesnensi Archiepiscopis: Archiepiscopus Baltimorensis provinciae Metropolitanus, et Suffraganeus, Episcopique omnes Baltimori in Concilio congregati. Salutem, gratiam, laudem, honorem et gloriam.

Unius ejusdemque mystici corporis membra, uno eodemque Spiritu acti, unius ejusdemque capitii vivifico influxu copulati, non potuimus, quamvis longo terrae marisque spatio separati, quaecumque passi estis, inclyt confessores, non sentire. Charitate enim Christi, nos urgente, flendum erat cum fleutibus, gaudendum cum gaudientibus. Vestrorum praecclare gestorum fama ad nos usque pervenit. Audivimus potentium in vos et in Ecclesiam inimica consilia, calumnias, minas, persecutio[n]es, exilia, careceres; audivimus Episcopalis animi robur invictum, constantiam, fidem; audivimus dignam Apostolorum successoribus mitissimam patientiam, prudenterissimam sapientiam: audivimus et mirati sumus. Mirum profecto nostris hisce temporibus quae tantis laudibus extolluntur ob excultos mores, politiores artes, altiores scientias, liberalioresque disciplinas, mirandum in regionibus evangelii luce illustratis, mirandum sub principibus religionem christianam proflentibus, persecutorum saecula, insidias et saevitiae revixisse. Sed Deo qui se Ecclesiae suae usque ad consummationem saeculi affuturum promisit, benigniter sapienterque providente, Constantis, Valentibus et Iulianis nostrorum temporum novos Athanasios et Basilius opposuit qui pro muro essent Ecclesiae suae, et avitam fidem patrumque instituta, Jura et leges tuerentur.

Flevimus quidem super contritione filiae populi nostri; flevimus super dispersos lapides sanctuarii; lacrymas fudimus super oves pastoribus orbatas; flevimus, sed et gaudio superabundavimus in tribulatione nostra, gavisi sumus de Christi confessorum perseverantia, de martyrum constantia, et de fidei athletarum victoria. Eia! Confessores, Martyres, Athletae Christi; Eia! qui pro vobis, qui vobiscum legitime certavit, Iste vos coronabit. Ne deditgeminis testimonium amoris, admirationis et reverentiae quod ex corde promunt vestrum amantissimi in Christo fratres in Provinciali Concilio congregati. Baltimori, die 20ma Maii, 1840.

But on the other hand we cannot close our eyes to the ruins piled upon all sides in those days of disorder and sorrow. The saintly bishop was declared "deposed" by the government and forced to retire into the bosom of his family in Westphalia after suffering an imprisonment of two years duration. While marks of sympathy and esteem poured in from all sides, the very corporation which should have been the first to set the example of fidelity to their pastor, not only refused every token of filial piety, but openly joined hands with the government. Yielding to the suggestion which came from Berlin, the cathedral chapter became guilty of the ignoble cowardice of choosing one of its members "capitulary vicar" or administrator of the archdiocese, as if the same had been vacant.

After the death of two such administrators the Holy See in concert with the venerable archbishop appointed "vicar-general" the canon Dr. Iven, who was the only member of the chapter who had betrayed neither his bishop nor his honor. It is useless to describe the difficulties of administering under such conditions a diocese which numbered 1,100,000 souls, 1,600 priests, and 800 parishes. The vicar-general was not without good will, zeal, and ability. But he was harassed at every step by the annoying measures of the government, by the attitude of the chapter and all refractory elements among the clergy who found support at Berlin as well as at Bonn and Cologne. Frederick William III. opposed to every move of the Holy See as a condition sine qua non the removal and the submission of the "revolutionary bishop." Death alone could bring the desired change. This change came when on June 7, 1840, Frederick William IV. ascended the throne of Prussia.

It is not in our province to speak of the high qualities of this monarch who possessed a truly noble heart and sincerely sought the best interests of all his subjects; suffice it to say that, he more than any other King of Prussia, was animated by a spirit of impartiality and benevolent solicitude for the Catholics. He had in mind to put an end as soon as possible to the "Kölner Wirren," "the

Cologne disorders." To recall Clement August would have been an open disavowal of his predecessor's policy, and would have turned the entire Protestant bureaucracy against him. On the other hand he was too noble minded to ask the Holy See to depose the venerable archbishop. His brother-in-law, Louis I., King of Bavaria, came to his assistance. It was necessary to choose an experienced administrator; a tried organizer; a prelate who had never taken part in the troubles with the Government nor in the party quarrels; a man who possessed the confidence of the Pope, of the Protestant sovereign, of the exiled archbishop, and who would be able to gain in a short time that of the people; a theologian and a strong character who could hold his own with Hermesianism, which had revived anew and was more obstinate than ever; a man with nerves of iron to forcibly repress the disorders which the disturbances of the last few years had given rise to in many places; a man of zeal to reanimate the lagging interest in works of faith; a man of prudence who could surmount innumerable difficulties without ever compromising dignity or duty; a man of charity to attract the scattered sheep and pave an easy way for their return to the fold; in short a truly superior personage and a bishop such as St. Paul describes; in a word, a true apostle of the nineteenth century. Louis I. found this providential character in his own kingdom, which at that time had no political connection with Prussia, in the person of John von Geissel, who occupied the bishopric of Speyer. He was born (in 1796) of humble but profoundly Catholic parents in the village of Gimmeldingen (Palatinate), and had the rare good fortune, at a time when theological rationalism pervaded even the seminary life and doctrine, to prepare himself for the priesthood at Mayence under the eyes of the excellent Bishop Colmar and the learned and pious Professor Liebermann. His extraordinary talents joined with solid piety soon raised him to the highest rank among the clergy of his native diocese, whose bishop he became in 1837. The good he there accomplished

during the five years of his episcopate would furnish sufficient material for a biography as interesting as it would be edifying.¹ But we are to study him in a much larger and more important field of activity, where "his candlestick was raised on high that his light of grace and science might shine for all those of the household, *i. e.* for all peoples in the Catholic Church."²

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

¹ See Pfuel, Vol. I, book I, 1-112.

² Eulogy of the great apostolic bishops pronounced in the Lateran Council under Martin I. Harduin T. III, p. 886.

Catholicism vs. Science, Liberty, Truthfulness.¹

On the sixteenth of last October the Rev. Brooke Herford delivered a lecture in Appleton Chapel, Harvard University, on "The Answer of Modern Liberalism to the Claims of the Roman Catholic Church." We set about preparing a refutation of this discourse on the morrow of its delivery, and finished the work a few weeks later; but, for certain sufficient reasons, publication of our present article has been postponed to this late date. Such delay is not without its advantages; for, if it robs the subjects of their living interest, it assures, on the other hand, greater calmness and objectivity, and rids one of first impressions.

We find special reason to think that our efforts will not be wasted, in the fact that this Boston discourse is not an isolated event. It is but a specimen of a sort of literature, unfortunately too prevalent in our day, which concerns itself with the Catholic Church generally, and in particular with her morals, both theoretic and practical. According to time and place this literature assumes different forms. Its most unworthy specimens are to be found in the newspaper columns, where the self-styled American protectorate repeats, as ignorant fanatics have repeated always and will continue to repeat, calumnies as absurd as they are effete. A step higher than these we find magazine articles, then come pamphlets, and, at the top, we have quite imposing volumes. In tone and taste these publications differ greatly from one another. In point of learning and veracity, we regret to say, the difference is not so great.

Taking into consideration the fact that a great number of the authors of this sort of literature are Protestant ministers, we cannot refrain from a remark which seems quite worthy their consideration. The very assault they direct against the Catholic Church are identical with those directed by others against all communions or against Christianity itself. As an instance, we would refer to Mr. Andrew White's "History of the Warfare of Science with Theology." A little reflection on this point

¹These pages are a communication from the Academy of Moral Sciences. Under the direction of Professor Bouquillon the following members collaborated in the work: Mr. Bertrand L. Conway, C. S. P.; Rev. James Dolan, Diocese of Albany; Rev. James Kirwin, Diocese of Galveston; Rev. John Lindsman, Diocese of Syracuse; Rev. John Lynch, Diocese of Albany; Mr. Joseph McSorley, C. S. P.

would surely make these writers more circumspect. There is also a certain method of polemics they should avoid, because it is adopted by the enemies of all religion. It consists in bestowing praise on the members of a body as individuals, while condemning the body as an institution. So Mr. Herford, for example, has "not ceased to admire the lives of religious heroism which illuminate its (*i. e.* Catholicism) history, and the qualities of obedience, piety, and self-sacrifice, of which one sees many beautiful examples in the humble and nameless lives of its rank and file." But what is not good, is the Catholic organization. "Catholicism is not only a religious spirit and thought, it is a great ecclesiastical organization, and it is as such that I have come to see the dangerousness of its claims." At the very moment the Rev. Brooke Herford was so speaking in Boston, the impious Parisian press, commenting on the influence of the new fiscal laws upon religious, wrote that the Sisters of Charity are admirable women ; it is their congregation that is bad.

We are in no way astonished that the orator undertook to excuse Judge Dudley for having laid a foundation directly opposed to religious peace and toleration. The circumstances pleaded in extenuation we shall notice later. Still less does it astonish us that he thought it necessary to excuse Harvard University for suffering, and this at the close of the nineteenth century, the delivery of lectures so impregnated with the spirit of fanaticism. What does astonish us, though, is that he believed himself in no great need of excuse for having undertaken such a task. So far is he from this, indeed, that he considers his education and experience have quite fitted him for the undertaking. We think otherwise. Mr. Herford seems to us to be poorly acquainted with his subject. Moreover, and to his credit be it said, he was unable to handle this subject in accord with the intentions of the founder; for, as a matter of fact, the lecture was instituted "for the purpose of detecting and correcting and exposing the idolatry of the Romish Church, its tyranny, usurpations, damnable heresies, fatal errors, superstitions, and other crying wickednesses in its high places. Finally, that the Church of Rome is that mystical Babylon, that man of sin, that apostate church spoken of in the New Testament." Such was the task set before Rev. Mr. Herford ; and though any one who reads his discourse may perceive he failed in every point specified, he is scarcely to be blamed for his shortcomings.

I.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH.

Catholicity does not fear an examination of her claims. She rather challenges such a test. Her demand is only that she be described as she is; that neither doctrine, institution, nor act of hers be falsely represented. Let readers judge for themselves if Mr. Brooke Herford has observed this elementary rule of justice.

The lecturer remarks first that the Catholic Church is not simply a church analogous to the other churches of our time. Nothing could be truer; the Catholic Church does not regard herself as one of a number of existing churches; she proclaims herself the Church. Mr. Herford adds that "its claim is most tremendous;" that "it claims to be the representative of the omnipotent Creator among men, and as such entitled to the same absolute submission as God Himself;" that, although its authority is specialized over faith and morals, nevertheless, "as morals have to do with almost every action and relation of life, and the Church itself is the sole judge of how far this jurisdiction applies, it practically means religious absolutism." Here we are at once in the presence of inaccuracy, confusion, and, if not misrepresentation, at least faulty exposition. The truth is that according to Catholics: *a*) Christ himself has not only preached a doctrine, but founded a church—that is to say, united his disciples in a spiritual society, supernatural, visible, universal, indefectible, a moral body of which Christ is the head and his disciples members. *b*) To this society he gave its constitution, according to which constitution the Church is composed of superiors and subjects, pastors and people. *c*) The authority of the pastors has for its object the realization in the world of Christ's work, the practice of his religion, Christian faith and Christian morals. *d*) As Christ himself fulfilled the triple office of prophet, priest, and king, so also he gave to the pastors of his church the triple power of teaching, sanctifying, and governing. *e*) This power is not principal, it is not absolute, not unlimited—it is secondary, subordinate, received by participation—that is to say, the pastors have the mission of teaching, preserving, defending, and explaining the truths promulgated by Christ, of administering the sacraments instituted by Christ, of ensuring the observance of the precepts imposed by Christ. Consequently, *f*) since human activity is indefi-

nite in scope, the Church does not pretend to direct it, except in so far as it bears relation to the Christian life, the sanctification of the soul: so that whether the faithful busy themselves with commerce or industry, whether they enter the army, the magistracy, or the political field, whether they buy estates or deposit their fortunes in banks, it is all one to the Church: she does not and cannot interfere. In like manner she leaves to the people themselves the choice of a form of government, the selection of a tax-system, the formation of alliances that appear useful or necessary—it is enough for her that in all this nations and individuals do not violate the principles of Christianity.

g) As the spirit of the Gospel is the spirit of liberty, as Christ has promulgated but a small number of commandments, so the ecclesiastical authority lacks both power and wish to overburden the faithful with a multitude of precepts; and, in point of fact, her commandments are really few in number. Finally it is well to remember that the direction of individual life is always left to man's own personal conscience. Where, then, is there absolutism or tyranny?

Mr. Brooke Herford affirms that few Protestants know the pretensions of the Church. This seems strange enough when we reflect that these are to be found in the creeds, the professions of faith, or the catechisms, everywhere numerous and accessible. And many Catholics, he asserts, know them but imperfectly. If there is question of Catholics who have received elementary religious instruction the statement is irredeemably and absolutely false. Finally, he affirms that the claim "is seldom pressed to day (in its extent) in England and America, at least it is seldom pressed at first." This, again, must be set down as false. The claim of the Church, as she and her children conceive it, is as clearly stated and strongly pressed in England and America as elsewhere. Was the innuendo meant to awaken suspicion?

Such, then, are the Church's pretensions. The lecturer did not think it suitable to discuss their logical basis, though such a proceeding would have been quite in keeping with the demands of science and the dignity of his audience. His work was confined to an attempt to demonstrate that "the real impossibility of the claim is seen, not so much in the inadequacy of its origin, as in the impotence and falsity of its results." He considers these results in the fields of science, liberty, and truthfulness. Let us follow him in detail.

II.

CATHOLICITY AND SCIENCE.

The mission of ecclesiastical authority is the teaching of divine science, the preserving, defending, explaining, of revealed truths. Has this mission been discharged? Has the Church succeeded in preserving intact during the course of nineteen centuries the original deposit of faith? Has she defended it against every attempt of corrupting or destroying influences since the days of Gnosticism, Manicheism, and Arianism, down to the period of modern Rationalism and Agnosticism? Has she worked in the persons of her doctors and by means of her schools toward the legitimate development of dogma? These are precisely the questions to be answered before deciding whether she has been true or false to her trust. Mr. Herford assures us that she has belied her mission, and the proof he would offer for his statement is to be found in the position assumed by the Church on the two questions of witchcraft and inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. Let us see if he is worthy of serious attention.

He condemns the Church because she "did not merely tolerate the belief in witchcraft," but "everywhere stimulated the persecution of those accused of the crime." Mr. Herford has borrowed this from Janus, with this modification, that he attributes to Catholicity what Janus attributes to Papal Infallibility. We answer that the position here assumed by Catholicity is exactly that of the Bible. In fact, as far as doctrine is concerned, Catholics admit (*a*) that evil spirits exist; (*b*) that such spirits possess powers superior to the powers of men; (*c*) that, with the Divine permission, the wicked spirits may make use of their powers; (*d*) that they can enter into communication with men; (*e*) that they can work wonders. Now all this is so evident from the Books of the Old and the New Testament, that it is quite useless to cite particular passages. And as far as morals are concerned, Catholics teach that the fact of entering into communication with the demons, or even the attempt to enter into such communication, constitutes a crime against religion and a crime worthy of punishment; for this, again, the Bible is an authority, positive and explicit. Consistently with this doctrine and this morale, the Church has constantly devoted herself to suppress both actual and attempted intercourse with evil spirits, and in the discipline

established for attaining this end she has accommodated herself to contemporary penalties and modes of procedure, to the circumstances of time, place, and nationality, in a word, to all the human measures at her disposal, never pretending that her tribunals were absolutely perfect, nor that they were possessed of infallibility; so that the startling quotations from Edwin C. Mead, or rather from Huber,¹ to the effect that, because Puritans once stimulated the persecution of the alleged witches, "therefore we say that the Puritan churches were far from infallible," is a bloodless wounding of imaginary foes. And if, indeed, the Church has not succeeded in crushing out an evil so widespread among all the old pagan nations, whether civilized or barbarian, she has at least hedged it in to no mean degree, and examination will show that the countries most under its ravishes to-day are not ones "in which her teaching has had absolute sway;" for this is a point where contemporary writers, no less than historians, furnish evidence in her favor that cannot be gainsaid.

If Mr. Herford's statements on the subject of witchcraft were surprising, amazing is the word for those with regard to the attitude of the Church toward the Bible. Since the lecturer seemingly hinted that the Roman Church took her cue from Protestantism in revering the sacred books, it seems worth while recalling to his mind that had it not been for the reverence and care with which the Church preserved the Bible through the centuries the Protestants would never have come in contact with it.

¹As Mr. Brooke Herford merely repeats the old-time accusations of Huber, it may be well to cite here a passage from Cardinal Hergenrother as to the facts of the case. He says (*Catholic Church and Christian State*, p. 340):

The belief in sorcery long prevailed, and was common to Catholics and Protestants. In 1560 John Wein, of Grave-on-the-Maas, physician to the Duke of Cleves, wrote against the burning of witches. In 1565 the Protestant legal faculty of Marburg condemned his work, and the author barely escaped a severe persecution, such as overtook Cornelius Loos. Also, the Jesuit Adam Tanner, Chancellor of the University of Prague, was most violently opposed in his endeavor to check the evil. Frederick von Spee, also a Jesuit, was the author of a work which marks an epoch in the struggle. It shows the immense difficulties attending even so able a resistance of the predominant belief. *No witches were burnt in Rome*, and an instruction which issued thence in 1657 effected much toward bringing legal proceedings more into accord with justice and truth. It called in the aid not merely of theologians and canonists, but even more imperatively of lawyers and physicians. Time alone could afford a complete remedy. The last witch was burnt at Glarus in 1783, not, as has been said, at Seville in 1781. It is very doubtful whether, as Huber says, Protestantism merely accepted the belief in witches as a legacy bequeathed to it by the Middle Ages. Carpzow's vehement opposition to Spee does not look like it; neither do the facts of the Protestant persecutions for witchcraft nor Luther's expressions about the devil. Certainly on this point Luther's judgment was not formed upon the example of St. Thomas Aquinas, whom he hated bitterly.

It is quite true, as Mr. Herford says, that the Council of Trent (Sess. 4) defined the two sources of faith to be the Sacred Scriptures and unwritten tradition ; that it gave the catalogue or canon of the books of the Old and New Testament, including therein the deuterocanonical ; that it declared that these books, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, had God for their author, and are inspired in whole and in part. But it is wholly false and a plain calumny to affirm that the Council decreed the "absolute verbal inspiration of the Bible." How could Mr. Herford possibly have made such a mistake with the text of the Council before his eyes ! It is in consequence equally false and calumnious to assert that Catholics are obliged to teach verbal inspiration, and that "efforts have been made to obtain from Rome some distinct permission to give up verbal inspiration, but in vain." How could such words possibly have come from Mr. Herford, when he had at his disposal Catholic books upon this subject, recently published at Rome and elsewhere by Franzelin, Ubaldi, Cornely, etc.? It is true that there is among Catholics some divergence of opinion as to the nature and extent of inspiration, and that Newman, for example, believed that it was not the intention of the Council of Trent to include among the parts inspired such minute passages as that referring to Tobias' dog wagging his tail, etc.; but it is utterly false to say that the same Cardinal "tentatively tried to take refuge in a sort of inspiration 'as to the substance of passages.'" How could such an assertion be made by Mr. Herford after reading Newman's own dissertation? Again, it is true that Leo XIII. has insisted that in matters of faith and morals the Scriptures are to be interpreted in the light of the Fathers, but one must twist his words and torture their sense in order to make it appear that he tries to impose upon Catholics the "cosmogonic ideas of the fourth-century Fathers." Rev. Mr. Herford affirms, in concluding this point, that "some of Rome's best scholars have already been compelled to withdraw from their allegiance, while others are hesitating between what they are obliged to accept as doctrine and what they know to be facts." Who are they? Or, at the very best, who are the scholars who have already been compelled to withdraw? To make such an assertion, slighting all proof, is to attempt a deceit. It is useless further to insist upon this subject ; but really it seems worth while to demand if such utterances, before such an audience,

did not fail of the respect due to an institution of Harvard's reputation? It were desirable that some of the students who listened to Mr. Herford should read certain passages (e. g., chap. 17) from the book of the ex-president of Cornell, a gentleman who surely does not speak from a Catholic standpoint.

The Church has not been directly instituted for the advancement of profane sciences any more than Our Lord's own missionary career was. St. Augustine has phrased this great truth in his own excellent style. "We do not read in the Gospel that the Lord said, I shall send the Paraclete, who will teach you concerning the course *of* the sun and the moon. He wished to make Christians, not astronomers. It is enough if men know of these things what they have learned at school."¹ If, then, it were proven that in the arts and sciences certain non-Catholic peoples were superior to Catholic peoples it would by no means follow that the Church is false; just as the demonstration that some pagan race, the Greek perhaps, is superior in culture to the Christians, would in no way affect the truth or falsity of the Christian religion. The supposition, however, is one that we are very far from admitting. The Church loves the arts and sciences, and everywhere she has aided in their development. She loves them for their own sake; for if God is admirable in his works, it is in man especially, the masterpiece of creation, that His power is best imagined. Consequently, the development of human intelligence, sentiment, and imagination is in the Church's eyes, homage rendered to the Creator: the penetration of abstract truths, of the laws of life, of the secrets of nature, the expression of the true and the beautiful in spoken word or in writing, upon canvas or on marble, the multiplication of discoveries and inventions—all tend to the glorification of God and directly or indirectly contribute to the end for which the Church was established. But the Church likewise loves the arts and sciences in view of their usefulness; for the Catholic faith, being neither a sentiment nor an instinct, but an exercise of the intelligence, presupposes reason. Reason furnishes the *preambula fidei*, establishes its claims, explains its object. And the Church has unceasingly defended reason's prerogatives against all efforts of scepticism, has put a high estimate upon the intellectual virtues, has striven unceasingly for the advancement of instruction by establishing schools, col-

¹De *actis contra Felicem Manichaeum*, Ib. I, n. 9, 10.

II.

CATHOLICITY AND SCIENCE.

The mission of ecclesiastical authority is the teaching of divine science, the preserving, defending, explaining, of revealed truths. Has this mission been discharged? Has the Church succeeded in preserving intact during the course of nineteen centuries the original deposit of faith? Has she defended it against every attempt of corrupting or destroying influences since the days of Gnosticism, Manicheism, and Arianism, down to the period of modern Rationalism and Agnosticism? Has she worked in the persons of her doctors and by means of her schools toward the legitimate development of dogma? These are precisely the questions to be answered before deciding whether she has been true or false to her trust. Mr. Herford assures us that she has belied her mission, and the proof he would offer for his statement is to be found in the position assumed by the Church on the two questions of witchcraft and inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures. Let us see if he is worthy of serious attention.

He condemns the Church because she "did not merely tolerate the belief in witchcraft," but "everywhere stimulated the persecution of those accused of the crime." Mr. Herford has borrowed this from Janus, with this modification, that he attributes to Catholicity what Janus attributes to Papal Infallibility. We answer that the position here assumed by Catholicity is exactly that of the Bible. In fact, as far as doctrine is concerned, Catholics admit (*a*) that evil spirits exist; (*b*) that such spirits possess powers superior to the powers of men; (*c*) that, with the Divine permission, the wicked spirits may make use of their powers; (*d*) that they can enter into communication with men; (*e*) that they can work wonders. Now all this is so evident from the Books of the Old and the New Testament, that it is quite useless to cite particular passages. And as far as morals are concerned, Catholics teach that the fact of entering into communication with the demons, or even the attempt to enter into such communication, constitutes a crime against religion and a crime worthy of punishment; for this, again, the Bible is an authority, positive and explicit. Consistently with this doctrine and this morale, the Church has constantly devoted herself to suppress both actual and attempted intercourse with evil spirits, and in the discipline

established for attaining this end she has accommodated herself to contemporary penalties and modes of procedure, to the circumstances of time, place, and nationality, in a word, to all the human measures at her disposal, never pretending that her tribunals were absolutely perfect, nor that they were possessed of infallibility; so that the startling quotations from Edwin C. Mead, or rather from Huber,¹ to the effect that, because Puritans once stimulated the persecution of the alleged witches, "therefore we say that the Puritan churches were far from infallible," is a bloodless wounding of imaginary foes. And if, indeed, the Church has not succeeded in crushing out an evil so widespread among all the old pagan nations, whether civilized or barbarian, she has at least hedged it in to no mean degree, and examination will show that the countries most under its ravishes to-day are not ones "in which her teaching has had absolute sway;" for this is a point where contemporary writers, no less than historians, furnish evidence in her favor that cannot be gainsaid.

If Mr. Herford's statements on the subject of witchcraft were surprising, amazing is the word for those with regard to the attitude of the Church toward the Bible. Since the lecturer seemingly hinted that the Roman Church took her cue from Protestantism in revering the sacred books, it seems worth while recalling to his mind that had it not been for the reverence and care with which the Church preserved the Bible through the centuries the Protestants would never have come in contact with it.

¹As Mr. Brooke Herford merely repeats the old-time accusations of Huber, it may be well to cite here a passage from Cardinal Hergenroether as to the facts of the case: He says (*Catholic Church and Christian State*, p. 340):

The belief in sorcery long prevailed, and was common to Catholics and Protestants. In 1560, John Wein, of Grave-on-the-Maas, physician to the Duke of Cleves, wrote against the burning of witches. In 1565 the Protestant legal faculty of Marburg condemned his work, and the author barely escaped a severe persecution, such as overtook Cornelius Loos. Also, the Jesuit Adam Tanner, Chancellor of the University of Prague, was most violently opposed in his endeavor to check the evil. Frederick von Spee, also a Jesuit, was the author of a work which marks an epoch in the struggle. It shows the immense difficulties attending even so able a resistance of the predominant belief. *No witches were burnt in Rome*, and an instruction which issued thence in 1657 effected much toward bringing legal proceedings more into accord with justice and truth. It called in the aid not merely of theologians and canonists, but even more imperatively of lawyers and physicians. Time alone could afford a complete remedy. The last witch was burnt at Glarus in 1783, not, as has been said, at Seville in 1781. It is very doubtful whether, as Huber says, Protestantism merely accepted the belief in witches as a legacy bequeathed to it by the Middle Ages. Carpzow's vehement opposition to Spee does not look like it; neither do the facts of the Protestant persecutions for witchcraft nor Luther's expressions about the devil. Certainly on this point Luther's judgment was not formed upon the example of St. Thomas Aquinas, whom he hated bitterly.

It is quite true, as Mr. Herford says, that the Council of Trent (Sess. 4) defined the two sources of faith to be the Sacred Scriptures and unwritten tradition ; that it gave the catalogue or canon of the books of the Old and New Testament, including therein the deuterocanonical ; that it declared that these books, having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, had God for their author, and are inspired in whole and in part. But it is wholly false and a plain calumny to affirm that the Council decreed the "absolute verbal inspiration of the Bible." How could Mr. Herford possibly have made such a mistake with the text of the Council before his eyes ! It is in consequence equally false and calumnious to assert that Catholics are obliged to teach verbal inspiration, and that "efforts have been made to obtain from Rome some distinct permission to give up verbal inspiration, but in vain." How could such words possibly have come from Mr. Herford, when he had at his disposal Catholic books upon this subject, recently published at Rome and elsewhere by Franzelin, Ubaldi, Cornely, etc.? It is true that there is among Catholics some divergence of opinion as to the nature and extent of inspiration, and that Newman, for example, believed that it was not the intention of the Council of Trent to include among the parts inspired such minute passages as that referring to Tobias' dog wagging his tail, etc.; but it is utterly false to say that the same Cardinal "tentatively tried to take refuge in a sort of inspiration 'as to the substance of passages.'" How could such an assertion be made by Mr. Herford after reading Newman's own dissertation? Again, it is true that Leo XIII. has insisted that in matters of faith and morals the Scriptures are to be interpreted in the light of the Fathers, but one must twist his words and torture their sense in order to make it appear that he tries to impose upon Catholics the "cosmogonic ideas of the fourth-century Fathers." Rev. Mr. Herford affirms, in concluding this point, that "some of Rome's best scholars have already been compelled to withdraw from their allegiance, while others are hesitating between what they are obliged to accept as doctrine and what they know to be facts." Who are they? Or, at the very best, who are the scholars who have already been compelled to withdraw? To make such an assertion, slighting all proof, is to attempt a deceit. It is useless further to insist upon this subject ; but really it seems worth while to demand if such utterances, before such an audience,

did not fail of the respect due to an institution of Harvard's reputation? It were desirable that some of the students who listened to Mr. Herford should read certain passages (e. g., chap. 17) from the book of the ex-president of Cornell, a gentleman who surely does not speak from a Catholic standpoint.

The Church has not been directly instituted for the advancement of profane sciences any more than Our Lord's own missionary career was. St. Augustine has phrased this great truth in his own excellent style. "We do not read in the Gospel that the Lord said, I shall send the Paraclete, who will teach you concerning the course of the sun and the moon. He wished to make Christians, not astronomers. It is enough if men know of these things what they have learned at school."¹ If, then, it were proven that in the arts and sciences certain non-Catholic peoples were superior to Catholic peoples it would by no means follow that the Church is false; just as the demonstration that some pagan race, the Greek perhaps, is superior in culture to the Christians, would in no way affect the truth or falsity of the Christian religion. The supposition, however, is one that we are very far from admitting. The Church loves the arts and sciences, and everywhere she has aided in their development. She loves them for their own sake; for if God is admirable in his works, it is in man especially, the masterpiece of creation, that His power is best imagined. Consequently, the development of human intelligence, sentiment, and imagination is in the Church's eyes, homage rendered to the Creator: the penetration of abstract truths, of the laws of life, of the secrets of nature, the expression of the true and the beautiful in spoken word or in writing, upon canvas or on marble, the multiplication of discoveries and inventions—all tend to the glorification of God and directly or indirectly contribute to the end for which the Church was established. But the Church likewise loves the arts and sciences in view of their usefulness; for the Catholic faith, being neither a sentiment nor an instinct, but an exercise of the intelligence, presupposes reason. Reason furnishes the *preambula fidei*, establishes its claims, explains its object. And the Church has unceasingly defended reason's prerogatives against all efforts of scepticism, has put a high estimate upon the intellectual virtues, has striven unceasingly for the advancement of instruction by establishing schools, col-

¹De actis contra Felicem Manichaeum, Ib. I, n. 9, 10.

leges, and universities, and fostering innumerable teaching communities. There have been men who were willing to proclaim reason "the devil's bride and a public prostitute," to name human learning a sin, the universities temples of Moloch ; but these men were not children of the Church. Rev. Mr. Herford knows them perhaps ; if not, let him read the works of Döllinger on the Reformation (I, 479-482) and Janssen (II, c. 6, par. 3.)

Despite all this Mr. Herford assures us that "again and again, in the gradual progress of human knowledge as to the nature of the world, the Catholic Church has not only not anticipated the general intelligence of its time, but has actually lagged behind it." He affirms that "this century of science has placed the question of such an infallible revelation as the Church claims under conditions which never existed before, and the examination of ancient documents which has become almost a branch supplies the final link in the chain of evidence against it." We might observe here that the Church concerns herself with the nature of the world only in so far as relating to God, that she does not receive new inspiration or revelation, but has been given the charge of preserving revealed truth and guarding the inspired books, and that she has been promised the Divine assistance in acquitting herself of this charge ; that the difficulties raised by modern science attack the pretensions of the Church much less directly than they do the Bible itself or even Divine revelation, and that in consequence, ministers of Rev. Mr. Herford's class would do far greater service to the cause of religion if, instead of combating Catholicity, they employed their knowledge and their leisure in refuting the enemies of Christianity. But omitting further reflection upon this point we go on to seek proofs of his statement, expecting of course to find some two or three, such as stories about the antipodes, comets, and the like. But the only point offered in evidence is the affair of Galileo, which of course proves simply nothing at all. Certainly the condemnation of Galileo's doctrine was an error, and this error was committed by an ecclesiastical tribunal of high rank, but surely the lecturer's hearers were not asked to believe that the congregation which condemned Galileo was the supreme infallible tribunal of the Church—wherefore the least we can say of the charge is that it is unmeaning. Granted that the effect of the condemnation was actually to deter Catholics from the investi-

gation of a single scientific question, are we supposed to conclude that, therefore, the Church is opposed to science? Reasoning in this manner, one might declare every court making a mistake to be opposed to justice. To come nearer home; does the record of Protestantism justify such free accusations against the Catholic Church? We refer our readers to Mr. Andrew Dickson White for an answer. "Nothing is more unjust than to cast especial blame for all this resistance to science upon the Roman Church. The Protestant Church, though rarely able to be so severe, has been more blameworthy. The persecution of Galileo and his compeers was at the beginning of the seventeenth century; the persecution of Robertson, Smith, and Winchell, and Woodrow and Toy, and the young professors at Beyrouth, by various Protestant authorities, was near the end of the nineteenth century. Those earlier persecutions by Catholicism were strictly in accord with principles held at that time by all religionists, Catholic and Protestant, throughout the world; these later persecutions by Protestants were in defiance of principles which all Christendom to-day holds or pretends to hold, and none make louder claim to hold them than the very sects which persecuted these eminent Christian men of our day, whose crime was that they were intelligent enough to accept the science of their time, honest enough to acknowledge it."¹

III.

CATHOLICITY AND LIBERTY.

There are many kinds of liberty which it will be useful not to confound. We distinguish natural liberty or free will, moral liberty or absence of obligation, external liberty or freedom from constraint. With regard to the free subject, we distinguish personal liberty as opposed to slavery, national liberty as opposed to foreign dominion, political liberty as opposed to despotism, and liberty of the Church as opposed to Cæsarism. With regard to the object of liberty, we distinguish liberty of thought, liberty of speech or of the press, liberty of education and instruction, liberty of worship, liberty of labor and trade, liberty of association.

Rev. Mr. Herford does not speak—and for good reasons—of free will, which is the foundation of all other liberty. Was it not the Church who defended the freedom of the will against

¹ History of the Warfare of Science with Theology, c. 2.

the fatalists and the Protestants, and who to-day upholds the same cause against the determinists? Nor does he speak of personal liberty. He knows too well that it was the Church which, after centuries of effort, finally suppressed slavery. Nor does he insist upon national liberty. He is not ignorant of the protection afforded all the European nations against the inroads of the Mussulman. He is aware that when the Thirteen Colonies started upon the formation of our great nation, the clergy that opposed their efforts was not the clergy of the Catholic Church; and again that the recent struggles of Spain to throw off Napoleon's heavy hand, and the successful efforts of the Belgians to establish a free nation, were supported most strongly by the Catholic clergy. Neither does Rev. Mr. Herford lay stress upon political liberty or government by representatives chosen according to constitutions freely established. He is too strongly conscious that in the Middle Ages, when the Church's authority was recognized on all sides, the freest of constitutions existed, and only at the dawning of "Reform" did theories of despotism and the divine right of Kings begin to develop and flourish, and that especially among nations strongly Protestant, so that a celebrated work, breathing the most intense spirit of liberty, could be printed in Spain with the royal sanction, though in "Reformed" England it was committed to the flames; and, finally, that as one by one modern nations have established representative and constitutional governments, the Church has shown herself free from any spirit of jealousy or repugnance. Of ecclesiastical liberty Mr. Herford says not a word. Why should he, when it has become a thing unknown wherever Protestantism rules?

It is especially upon civil liberties that the lecturer insists, freedom of thought, of speech, of the press, of worship, of education. "What about liberty of worship? What about liberty of education?" Truly, these interrogations astonish us. Nine years ago Leo XIII. published his celebrated encyclical on Liberty, and it gave, with all the weight of his authority, a complete answer to these questions. Nor is there any lack of standard Catholic works upon the subject. We may name as samples: "Cas de Conscience," by Mgr. Parisis, the famous Bishop of Langres; "Les Principes de '89," by Godard; the noted work of Hergenröther, "Catholic Church and Christian State," "Les Questions Religieuses et Sociales de notre temps," by

Sauvé; "La Liberté de Conscience," by Janet. Here it must suffice that we briefly expose the doctrine and establish the accuracy of the facts.

The Church teaches that man's free will is subject to the Divine law and to the human law based upon the Divine; that the end of all law is to direct human activity toward good and away from evil, and thus to promote true liberty, which consists in the faculty a man possesses of developing himself according to his nature and his end; that since not all evil can be prevented, a greater or less amount of tolerance is necessitated, never, however, to such an extent as to permit what is essentially destructive of order and society; whence, it follows that, though there can nowhere be, in right or in fact, absolute, unlimited liberty, there, nevertheless, remains a vast field where man's activities can and should develop without interference. Moreover, according to Catholic teaching, the conditions required for a human law go a long way towards the safeguarding of liberty by preventing the abuse of authority. Where Catholic doctrine prevails man is not subject to the law of the strong hand; when vested with a just title, no one can interfere with him, and he cannot be overwhelmed with a multitude of precepts, because nothing can be required or commanded unless what is just and directed to the common good. Neither is man exposed to arbitrary oppression, for it is not the good pleasure of authority which determines the force and extent of obligations.

As far as regards liberty of worship we cannot do better than quote the words of Bishop Keane in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XV, p. 303. "Most of the current misapprehensions of Catholic teaching have for their source incorrect notions of liberty, right, and law. We will first glance at these. Man has the *natural liberty* to think, speak, and act as he chooses; in other words, he has *free will*. But man has not the *moral liberty* to think, speak, and act as he chooses. His thoughts, his words, his acts, are subject to the moral law. He has *no right* to direct his intellect except to the true, nor his will except to the good. It would be absurd to suppose a right to what is wrong. Thus the difference between *free will* and *right* is manifest. Next, as to *legal liberty*, we easily perceive that it can not be as wide and unlimited as *free will*, since law and authority aim at hindering *free will* from encroaching on public order and individual rights. On the other hand, law and author-

ity have their limits, since they can neither command all that is good nor hinder all that is evil. The limits of law and civil authority will necessarily be wider or narrower, according to the circumstances of the people in question. In some countries law must be content with protecting or enforcing certain essential principles, in others it may go further. In America, for instance, the unity of marriage is protected, not so its indissolubility. Sunday observance, in various degrees, is enacted as to external order, but not as to religious celebration." And on the same subject Bishop Keane has written (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XV., p. 515): "It would be absurd to suppose that man has the natural right to form a creed for himself according to his good pleasure. On the contrary, he is under a natural obligation to follow only the truth. But this is an obligation between his conscience and God. It is unquestionably true that man has a natural right not to be forced by any human power to accept a creed; and the Church has always proclaimed this right in the words of St. Augustine: 'Nemo credit nisi volens.' But on the other hand, has man a natural right to regulate his life, and especially his exterior acts according to the creed which he has freely embraced? Yes, if that creed be true; no, if it be false. In the latter case if the individual be in good faith, he is excusable before God and his conscience; but even then, no matter how perfect his good faith, the civil authority has the right, as seen above, to hinder him from practices contrary to the natural law and to public good order. One may be in perfect good faith in practising polygamy or human sacrifices; nevertheless the law forbids them, and rightly. This principle is admitted in the United States, as elsewhere. It is manifest, therefore, that the right to enjoy one's creed is not so broad as some writers seem to suppose."

We have only to add that the bulwark of real liberty of conscience is the distinction of the two powers, the ecclesiastical and the civil, and that it is the Church, and the Church alone, which has ever maintained this distinction in the face of the world. To quote again from the same writer: "Not only do we affirm that the Catholic Church has always maintained this principle; we add that she alone has done so. The world knows how it has fared with the separated Christians of Russia and the East; they have fallen into subjection to the State even in all things spiritual. It is well known that among the followers of

the 'Reformation' the civil power gradually took control of religious matters; that Henry VIII. forced from his subjects an oath, acknowledging the royal supremacy in things spiritual, and that the Protestant princes of Germany held to the axiom: 'Cujus regio illius et religio.' Such was likewise the doctrine of the self-styled philosophers of the last century."

As to the practice of liberty, and most especially liberty of worship, liberty of conscience, and liberty of education, Catholics have no lesson to learn from Protestants. Never has it been our fortune to encounter greater naïveté than was shown by an English clergyman coming to Boston to inform us that "in countries where it (the Church) is in ascendancy nothing is heard of liberty and nothing is known of it." How long ago was it that our cousins in England learned something about liberty? In Mr. Lecky's new book we have the confession that "it is somewhat humiliating to observe how slowly this constitutional equality was attained;"¹ indeed, it is only since 1813 and 1817 that Dissenters have been allowed to enter the army and navy; it is only since 1828 that they have been admitted to civil offices on an equality with members of the Established Church by an abolition of the *Test*. Not until 1829 was the Catholic Emancipation Act passed. Only in 1854 did the Non-conformists obtain the privilege of standing for the humble degree of B. A. at the old English Universities. Before that period "English Dissenters were not only excluded from the inestimable advantages of higher education, and from the many great prizes connected with the universities, they were also seriously impeded, by the want of a university degree, in their subsequent professional career."² It is less than twenty years' since the last remaining religious qualifications were abolished and Dissenters admitted to all grades without distinction. We speak only of simple citizens; as to the royal family, its religious liberty is so complete that were the Prince of Wales to become convinced that his present religion is untrue, and were he to act in accord with that conviction by professing his new faith, he would beyond doubt fail of ever reaching the throne.

Now, to address our readers upon a more delicate question: What is the history of religious tolerance in our own country? Far be it from us to press home charges against our fellow coun-

¹Democracy and Liberty, vol. I, p. 514.

²Ibid., p. 516.

trymen ; but where our faith and our honor as Catholics have been assailed, the least that can be asked of us is that we present the facts and ask, as Americans of Americans, Is it true that men of our faith have monopolized narrowness and intolerance? Maryland's Charter of Liberty was destroyed as soon as Protestants obtained a majority. Every schoolboy knows the regime popular during Colonial days in New England and New York. No doubt our Federal Constitution rejected, as far as it could, all religious distinctions, but it is within the province of each individual State to legislate concerning public worship, charitable appropriations, education, and it is matter of note how slowly perfect religious equality has made its way throughout the whole Union ; even in 1830 it had not yet become complete.

Mr. Brooke Herford speaks of Catholic Austria; why does he say nothing of Protestant Prussia, where on two distinct occasions, and within the space of less than fifty years, restrictive laws have been enacted, bishops and priests imprisoned or exiled, and churches robbed. He mentions Spain; why is he silent as to Sweden? Was there nothing to be said?—or rather was there something to be omitted, lest his false thesis should be exposed? Mr. Lecky has some very significant remarks upon the subject. In Sweden, not many years ago, every administrative and judicial function was strictly limited to the professors of the Lutheran creed. Even the practice of medicine and the right of teaching were confined to them. Every Swede who abandoned the religion of his country was liable to banishment for life. It was not until 1860 that the existence of dissenting bodies was, under severely specified conditions, recognized ; but in 1862, 1870, and 1873 laws were passed permitting Swedish Lutherans to join other religions, and opening *nearly* all public posts and employments, as well as the seats in the legislature, to men of all religions."¹ But disregarding all omissions, nothing could be more thoroughly and more absurdly false than Mr. Herford's innuendo about Belgium "under the recent revival of Catholic regime." As soon as Belgium had acquired independence in 1830, she established a constitution in which absolute religious freedom and full constitutional privileges were guaranteed to everybody. This constitution, the most liberal in Europe, had to be revised in 1893, after having been strictly observed for more than half a century, and it was quite Catholic, quite sub-

¹ *Ibid.*, page 256.

missive to the authority of the Church, who presided at the revision and possessed not only a majority, but nearly a two-thirds membership of the entire congress. Did they propose to restrain the liberties of the press, of religious worship, of education? Not at all,—far from it. The only action taken was in the direction of enlarging political rights, in the democratic sense, and thus were verified the words written by Cardinal Sterkx in 1864: "I make bold to predict, with no fear of being belied, that the Catholics will never ask for the suppression of the liberty granted to the dissenters. They could have limited that liberty in 1830; they could even have suppressed it entirely. If the thirteen priests who took part in that congress, with their numerous friends, had chosen to combine, they could easily have passed a system of intolerance. If they did not, it was because justice, charity, love of the public peace, and loyalty made it their duty to maintain the rights which the dissenters had acquired by long and peaceable possession. Now, it is evident that this duty will daily become more imperative, and that it will never permit the Catholics to exclude the dissenters from the engagement of the common liberties. Their religious convictions will always make them regard the dissenters as in error; but they must always recognize that the dissenters, as Belgian citizens, possess acquired rights to the enjoyment of their religious liberty." This attitude of the Cardinal Archbishop is confirmed by the action of Leo XIII. in recommending the Catholics of Belgium to maintain and defend their constitution. Was Rev. Mr. Herford conscious of all this? If he was, he needs no verdict of ours to adjudge him. Was he ignorant?—then he paid but a sorry compliment to the University of which we Americans are wont to boast. One word more. While Catholic Belgium was thus immovable in fidelity to her constitutional liberty, another little nation—but one in which Protestants had a majority,—imitated Prussia by taking part in a religious persecution. We speak of Switzerland.

Such is the doctrine, such the practice of the Church as regards liberty. The principles are inculcated always and everywhere; the application of the principles varies somewhat according to circumstances; but that which never varies is the broad spirit of tolerance which the Catholic Church has exhibited during all the centuries. We quote again from Bishop Keane: "The acts of the sovereign pontiffs, not less than the teach-

ing of the weightiest theologians, show that a system of religious liberty may be approved even among a people whose majority are Catholics, nay, that Catholics are allowed to bind themselves by promise, and even by oath, to maintain such liberty;¹ and the writer goes on to cite in evidence the permissions given by the Holy See for oaths of fidelity to governments and constitutions establishing full liberty of worship. The enactment of the French Republic, Napoleon's coronation oath, the charter granted by Louis XVIII., the law of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and the Constitution of Louis Phillippe, offer cases in point.

Naturally the question of allegiance comes up for treatment, "Whether Catholics are really free to render a complete and undivided allegiance to the civil government of their country?" Mr. Herford refers us to Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." Common fairness would have prompted a reference also to the triumphant rejoinders to this pamphlet made by Bishops Ullathorne, Clifford, Vaughan, and above all, by Cardinals Newman and Manning, the first, in a letter to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk, the second, in a pamphlet called "The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance." Mr. Herford repeated some lines from Gladstone's pamphlet, which was an "appeal to absolute fanaticism;" we shall cite other lines from the letter written by Cardinal Manning to the *Times* newspaper (November 7, 1874): "The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster conceives it his duty to explain to fair-minded readers what was the connection of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility with civil allegiance. He judged a sufficient answer to trumped-up charges would be found in his written statement: First, that the Vatican Decrees have in no jot or tittle changed either the obligations or the conditions of civil allegiance. Second, that the civil allegiance of Catholics is as undivided as that of all Christians and of all men who recognize a divine or natural moral law. Third, that the civil allegiance of no man is unlimited, and therefore the civil allegiance of all men who believe in God, or are governed by conscience, is in that sense divided. Fourth, in this sense, and in no other, can it be said with truth that the civil allegiance of Catholics is divided. The civil allegiance of every Christian man in England is limited by conscience and the law

¹*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XV., p. 305.

of God, and the civil allegiance of Catholics is limited neither less nor more."

Is it difficult to believe that no man, no Christian, no Catholic can promise to an authority purely human, absolute and complete allegiance? All allegiance is limited by the judgment of conscience, which is the interpreter and echo of the Divine law. We know that there are men who refuse to admit this, and that Hobbes calls it a revolutionary doctrine; but it is a doctrine common to all Christians, and we think Mr. Herford, on reflection, must admit it. Is it anything but a paraphrase of the words of St. Peter and St. John, We must obey God rather than men? Now, whether the supreme judgment of conscience be based upon the light of individual reason, or on the authority of the learned, or on texts of the Bible, or on the word of a religious authority freely accepted, is quite a secondary matter. Certainly it is better that man, in forming his conscience should be guided by an authority Divinely inspired, than by the unaided light of individual reason; especially is it better that he should form his conscience according to religious authority, rather than in conformity with a vague public sentiment or the mandate of some officer of a secret society.

It would have been strange if Mr. Herford, in his discourse, had failed to mention the syllabus. So a paragraph has been devoted to this subject. We will not now delay in order to formally refute it by insisting upon acknowledgment of the origin, character, authority, and signification of this Papal document; for that we would require a whole dissertation. We limit ourselves to referring our readers to the works of Dupanloup, Falconi, Maupied, Rinaldi, Chiaf, Hergenröther (Chr. State, Essay V.), and above all to the encyclical letters of Leo XIII. on the Christian Constitution of States and on Liberty, in which documents may be found the best authorized interpretation of the Syllabus. We remark, meanwhile, that Mr. Herford appears not to have read the Syllabus. If he had read it, could he really speak of "anathema," a word which is not used in it even equivalently? At least he has not understood it; else how could he say the Pope condemned liberty of speech or of worship, when, as a matter of fact, the Pope condemned only the claim of absolute liberty as a right proper to each human being. And at best he is incapable of sensibly interpreting the syllabus, for which duty he should know the distinction between

propositions definite and indefinite, propositions simple and complex, condemnations attaching the mark of falsity and others attaching scandal, impiety, etc. If Mr. Herford were capable of interpreting the document, could he be rash enough to say that by the twenty-third proposition "every worst wrong in history is claimed as a right capable of being used wherever needed," while the condemnation in no way necessitates the supposition that in the exercise of their power Popes have remained free from all faults and mistakes, specially in administrative and private matters." Finally, Mr. Herford appears unable to compare the doctrines of the syllabus with the practice of all civilized nations. Where, let us ask, has there ever existed absolute liberty for every form of worship, even false, immoral, and forbidden by the natural law? Certainly not in India under English rule, nor in the United States while the Edmonds law holds with regard to the Mormons (Cf. Lecky, vol. I.). And the press; can any one propagate publicly falsehood, calumny, immorality? Certainly, if there is little preventive censure, there exists everywhere repressive laws of severe type.

IV.

CATHOLICITY AND TRUTHFULNESS.

It appears that the great sin of Catholicity, the crowning proof that it is not of divine origin, is to be found in its want of sincerity. Rev. Brooke Herford devotes at least half of his discourse to the consideration of this point. He assures his audience that, not only according to his opinion, but in the opinion "of the most liberal and friendly observers, the Catholic priesthood seems (in this point of sincerity) curiously weak." How does the reverend gentleman come to launch such a grave accusation in the face of a great body like the Catholic clergy in general and the American Catholic clergy in particular? It must needs be that his evidence is overwhelming; else he would merit the qualification of calumniator.

By way of introduction he remarks that two words,—Catholic to the core,—*Jesuit* and *casuistry*,—have become synonyms for duplicity. Then ir. solemn array are paraded before his hearers mental reservations, calumnies legalized in self-defence, dispensations from promises made to heretics, pious frauds, historic lies, and a long series of airy nothings, without indication of

time, place, person, or authority. What basis is there to these accusations?

It is indeed deplorable that among almost all Christian nations a word derived from the adorable name of our Savior has become synonymous with disloyalty and duplicity. But who is responsible for this fact—those who have borne this name or their enemies? Is it the imprudence and the faults of the former, or is it the malignity of the latter that has brought this about? Why has not the name of Jesuit become a synonym for obedience, apostolic zeal, and science, as the name of Benedictine is for patient labor and solid erudition? This is what we must consider before deducting from an unfortunate fact a prejudice against Catholicity. Is it not true that the Christian name itself has been a synonym for the impious and the criminal? *Quos per flagitia invisos vulgus. Christianos nominat* (Sueton).

As to casuistry, we must remark that it is merely the art of applying rules of conduct to particular facts; the judge on his bench uses casuistry as well as the priest directing and counselling consciences in his confessional. Casuistry supposes a complete science of principles, a just appreciation of things, a profound knowledge of the human heart; it is an art as elevated as it is difficult. Not only the application of laws, but legislation itself, can be casuistical—that is to say, can be expressed in the form of responses, decrees, and judgments, rather than as canons, principles, articles; such, for instance, is the character of the Roman law, the Canon law, and of English and American law. The interpretation, explanation, and teaching of law also can be casuistical, rather than dogmatic, and this is a method singularly calculated to develop reflection, the spirit of analysis, and the sense of equity; and it is for this reason that men consider the study of the Pandects as among the best means of forming the juris-consult. In moral theology the epithet, casuistical, is applied to that method which consists of shunning speculative points or questions of erudition, and devoting one's self to the exposition of practical rules, entering into such details as are embraced in the ordinary life of the Christian people; and in this sense is the work of St. Alphonsus casuistical. Nevertheless, strictly speaking, casuistry is but the ex professo solution of cases, fictitious or real. The name of casuistry and casuists is comparatively recent, but the thing itself has always existed in the Church

in the shape of *Poenitentialia*, *Confessionalia*, *Summae casuum conscientiae*, &c.; it has likewise been known to various pagan peoples. The Talmud of the Hebrews is well known to all scholars. Doubtless among casuists we find sober and prudent men, and again we find men imprudent and intemperate; some there have been over severe, as Sainte-Beuve and Pontas, while others have been lenient, as Diana; but I have not the least hesitation in affirming that the casuists of the divine law will, in general, have nothing to fear from comparison with the casuists of human law; and that if among them some have seemed to enter into puerile details at times, or have given solutions more or less laughable, they are in this respect at least far above the casuists of the Talmud.¹ For the rest we must not lose sight of the fact that the casuist is practical and must be a *minimist*, since his business is to determine the lowest limits of obligation. I conclude that if the terms casuist and casuistry to-day have an evil ring we must seek the cause not so much in the excesses of certain theologians as in the calumnious railings of Pascal. In any case it is a crying injustice to found thereon a prejudice against Catholicity. Let this brief sketch suffice to make known the truth.

Casuistry is a sort of bugaboo; Rev. Mr. Herford has conjured it up at Boston, as Mr. Lea lately resurrected it at Philadelphia. The latter gentleman informs his good readers that "casuistry was the natural outcome of probabilism," and that "the art of the casuist is a wonderful exhibition of technical dialectic which has nothing in common with morals," etc. He has yet to prove his competency to deliver general verdicts in questions of Catholic theology after premising upon Jesuitry and casuistry. The production thus far published by him would scarcely satisfy a board of examiners, I fancy.² Indeed, we would willingly pass over his ignorance of the writings of theologians, if he were only acquainted with the treatment vouchsafed to this question by modern critics known to every

¹If anyone wishes to have an idea of Jewish casuistry he may consult the Talmud translated by Moses Schwab. Take for example the treatise *Berakhot*; the Mischna begins like this: "At what moment does one commence to recite the prayers of schema?" From the instant the priests enter the temple to eat the troumâ or oblation up to the end of the first vigil. This is the opinion of Rabbi Eleazar; the other sages say up to midnight, and Rabbi Gamaliel says up to daybreak." And this casuistry is carefully diluted through ten pages of the Guemara.

²See the articles of Rev. Dr. Bouquillon in the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN for July, 1895, and January, 1896, "Henry C. Lea as a Historian of Moral Theology," and "Occult Compensation."

man of taste and culture. Some ten or twenty years ago the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, of Paris, offered a prize for the best essay "exposing or discussing in its principles and practical applications the theory of cases of conscience according to the Stoic school." M. Raymond Thamin responded by a work which the Academy crowned "A moral problem of antiquity: Study of the casuistry of Stoicks." Apropos of this essay Ferd. Brunetiére, the noted critic, wrote some interesting pages in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for January, '85. He remarks that the majority of those with whom casuistry is in worst odor, do not even understand what it is, and apparently are very little concerned to learn. He insists in the face of the vulgar opinion, that casuistry is a thing quite independent of every time, place, and religious creed; that it is to be found among the Stoicks, the philosophical school that has been of all most careless of theological prejudice, and that if the Stoicks recognized the interest, utility, and necessity of casuistry, this is only because casuistry, independently of any dogma, or of any theology, corresponds to something unmistakably, profoundly, and essentially human. He recognizes that if casuistry existed before Stoicism, if it was cultivated by Socrates, Aristotle, Epicurus, the great tragic poets, nevertheless, the Stoicks it was that reduced it to an art, and introduced it into the schools as a part of morals. M. Brunetiére reminds us that the cases proposed by the Stoicks show perfect resemblance to those discussed by the theologians of the seventeenth century, and that the solutions given indicate the same divergence of mind. To quote,—"Can one pass counterfeit money palmed off on himself?" asked somebody in the school; and Diogenes of Babylon—who was not a Jesuit, no, not even a Christian,—answered yes; Antipater, however, said no. In selling a wine which will soon sour, must one inform the purchaser of the defect? No, said Diogenes, always lenient to the sinner; but Antipater, more strict, said the seller must warn the buyer. If we find among Catholic casuists some chimerical cases, none the less are they to be found among the Stoicks. Seneca, for instance, proposes the following case: If a man deprived of both arms by fortune of war, surprises his faithless wife, flagrante delicto, and orders his son to kill her, what should the son do?

Mr. Brooke Herford further affirms that Catholicity "has

elevated mental reservation and evasion into a system, so that the world is always puzzled how far to receive Catholic assurances and declarations at their face value." Must we then once again answer this sturdy old calumny?¹ If so, let us be permitted to use as few words as possible.

The essence of a lie is in *saying the contrary of what is thought*. The voluntary utterance of a falsehood necessarily implies the will to deceive, and such will, even when not expressed, is nevertheless implied in every exact definition of a lie. Everyone knows that a large body of pagan philosophers (their testimony may be seen in the *Antologion* of John Stobaeus) have believed with Plato that for just cause a lie may be permitted. The same doctrine pleased certain Christian writers of the first centuries, such as Origin, Cassian (*Coll. 17*), S. Hilary of Poitiers (in *Ps. 14*), Martin of Braga, (*Opusc. I.*, c. 4); but was opposed with vigor and extirpated from the church's domain by St. Augustine. Later, in the sixteenth century, it was again taken up by Melancthon, Jean Bodin, (*Daemonomania*), Albericus Gentilis (*De Bello*), and developed and propagated by a long line of philosophers and theologians of the Protestant belief. It will suffice to cite Grotius, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, Lib. III, c. 1, n. 9, sqq.; Puffendorff, *De Jure Gentium*, Lib. IV, c. 1, s. 13, and *De Officio Hominis et Civis* L. V, c. 10, s. 8-10; Sam. Cocceius, *Diss. Proeem. XII*, L. V., c. 5, s. 1; Heineccius, *De Jure Nat.-et Gentium*, L. I., c. 7, s. 196-205; Jeremy Taylor, *Ductor Dubit.*, L. III, c. 2, Rule 5,—not to cite Milton, Johnson, Paley, etc. All these writers say that a lie is forbidden except when the person addressed has no right to the truth; they pretend, even, that only then is there a lie, strictly so called; for, according to their definition, a lie is "a statement repugnant to the existing and continuing right of him to whom

¹The controversy about mental reservations was initiated by the Protestants of the sixteenth century. I find it for instance in a book published in 1600, and entitled *Capitula doctrinae Jesuitarum et quorundam aliorum pontificiorum doctorum*. Malderus, the learned Bishop of Antwerp, answered in a treatise, *De restrictionum mentalium abusu*. Soon afterwards, and especially under the influence of the Jansenists, the controversy began to divide Catholic writers themselves. Without mentioning the literature provoked by the Provinciales, the condemned propositions, and the *Extrait des Assertions dangereuses*, we will cite the *Dissertatio de acquivocatione* of John Barnes, and the answer to it by Theophilus Reynaud, *De acquivocatione et restrictione mentali*; the *Haploes* of Caramuel; the treatise on mental reservations by the Carmelite John of St. Thomas; the *Dissertazione dogmatica e morale contro l' uso materiale delle parole*, written by the Dominican Aug. Orsi against the Jesuit Cattaneo; finally in our own day, Kingsley's attack on Catholic teaching and Newman's answer (*Apologia*, part 7, and appendix). We might mention in addition some excellent remarks made by Manning in his letters to Robert Wilberforce (*Lfe of Manning*, Vol. II, p. 39).

it is directed." In conformity with this definition, Benjamin Constant, at the end of last century, maintained against Kant that duty requires that we tell the truth only to those having a right to it, (*Oeuvres* tom. III, p. 6; see also Kant's *D'un pré-tendu droit de mentir per humanité*); and we think that even to-day a great many Protestant moralists are of similar opinion. (See Borden P. Brown, *Principles of Ethics*, pp. 221-225; Newman Smyth, *Christian Ethics*, p. 393.) Catholics, on the contrary, since the days of St. Augustine, are unanimous in teaching that the act of saying the contrary of one's thought can never be lawful, that it is *intrinsically and absolutely evil*, because opposed to the very nature of man and of society. We say *unanimous* teaching, for we are hardly called upon to reckon with a few rare exceptions, such as Marcus Marullus in the fifteenth century, in his work "*De religiose vivendi institutione*," or Bolgeni at the commencement of our own century, in his work *Del Possesso*, n. 157, or the anonymous author of an article published in the *Mélanges Théologiques* (Ser. VI, p. 410). Hence it may be permitted us to conclude that in the matter of veracity and falsehood the doctrine which one would naturally name "Catholic" is decidedly strict, while that in vogue among a considerable number of Protestants is quite broad, not to say *very lax*.

And now a word as to reservation. A reservation, or restriction, is the limitation of an affirmation or negation. If not verbally expressed, it can sometimes be indicated by circumstances, or again, it can be purely mental. Now, according to Catholic teaching explicitly confirmed by the Popes, the use of a reservation purely mental is equivalent to a lie, and consequently is never lawful. As to the use of reservation not purely mental (equivocation or amphibology), it is, in general, forbidden, and that, not because equivalent to a lie, but because, since it expresses the truth in a way very obscure and hard to fathom, it is the occasion of the hearer's being deceived. It can, however, be permitted with just cause, in virtue of the principle of morals that we can lawfully perform an act having two effects, the one good and the other evil, whenever the good effect is superior to the bad. Such are the doctrinal limits inside which Catholics admit the use of reservations, always recognizing that in practice the matter is a most delicate one; for frequently we can scarcely determine whether or not the reservation is purely mental.

and whether there is a just cause for permitting it—hence wide divergence of solutions among different theologians. Protestants reject absolutely the use of reservation. If they rejected it only as useless to themselves there would be no call to say more, for in point of fact they have no need of any reservations, it being far easier roundly to state the exact contrary of one's thought. But to admit that a lie is in some instances lawful, to admit even that it is in itself indifferent (Sam. Cocceius op. cit.), and at the same time to qualify as immoral the conduct of those who, recognizing a lie to be illicit, seek an honest way of evading inopportune questions, while leaving truth unharmed; such a line of attack besides implying self-contradiction, smacks of what good Christians call Phariseism. To say, therefore, that one can never put confidence in the word, the promise, or the oath of Catholics, because one cannot be certain that they will not find cause for mental reservation, is a crying injustice. Consistency demands, at least, that such a statement be supplemented by this other: one can never place faith in the word of Protestants, because one cannot be sure that they will not regard him as having no right to the truth, and so bravely lie.

Mr. Brooke Herford "has been struck with this: that even from the best outside friends and admirers of Catholicism it is almost impossible to obtain any clear answer when you ask them what they believe to be the truth about the charge that Catholicism teaches that faith need not be kept with heretics." 'Tis pity these best friends and admirers of Catholicism were unable to afford Rev. Mr. Herford the information required. But in event of failure it might have occurred to him that Catholics themselves could advance some instruction about their own doctrine. Had he taken the simple course of consulting sources of recognized authority, he might now be aware that according to Catholic principles a compact may be lawfully entered into with heretics, necessary conditions being observed; that for good and sufficient reasons it is permitted to promise religious liberty; that this promise may be confirmed with an oath; and that it must be strictly fulfilled; for, as St. Thomas teaches, *servare fidem est de jure naturali*. In learning all this, Rev. Mr. Herford would also have become aware that his assertions to the contrary constitute a gross calumny which in honor requires retraction; possibly he would have grown ashamed of again resurrecting a lie which has appeared in public at regular intervals during the

last four centuries, to be periodically refuted. It might be well here to insert a few references to writers who answered Mr. Herford's charges long before he was himself in existence. Such were in 1544, Hermann Lethmatius, *De instauranda relig.*, lib. 2; in 1566, Alanus Copus, *Dial.*; in 1581, Edmund Campion, *Decem Rationes*, rat. 4; in 1585, Johannes Molanus, *De fide haereticis servanda*; in 1611, Heribertus Rosweidt and Robertus Sweert in their dissertations against Daniel Plancius, *De fide haereticis servanda*; in 1608, 1609, 1611, Martin Becanus in his pamphlets *Quaestio Theologica*, *Quaestiones Miscellaneae*, *Quaestiones batavicae*, *De fide haereticis servanda*; in 1612, Jean Marquez, *El Gobernador Christiano*, lib. 2, c. 24; in 1645, John de Lugo, *De fide*, disp. XIX, n. 124, etc. Having consulted these writers, Mr. Herford, if convinced of nothing else, would at least be assured that no foundation for such a calumny can be found in the words and acts of the Council of Constance. In fact it is by an ascertained error that some writers, notably Gieseler, have laid at the door of the Council a decree stating *nullam fidem haereticis esse servandam*. (See *Historische politische Blaetter*, IV, 421; Hergenröther, *Church and State*, Essay XVI, part 2, ¶ 201, 2, n. 296; Jungmann, *Church History*, VI, p. 339, and especially Hefele's *History of the Councils*, VII, ¶ 767.) Neither is it true that the Council violated John Huss's safe conduct,—the document was intended to guard him from *foreign* interference, and by no means implied impunity from the ordinary process of law. His contemporaries and the Bohemians themselves so understood it, as is shown in their letter to Sigismund: “*Quod si jure et legitima probatione reus inveniatur, fiat cum ipso quod convenit.*” And speaking of fidelity to promises given, let us put a question to Rev. Mr. Herford—a question of history. Does he really think that during the religious wars the Lutherans and Calvinists, *et id omne genus*, scrupulously observed the promises made to Catholics, *e. g.*, in France, Holland, and Germany? Has he ever heard in our own day of public compacts violated to the detriment of Catholics?

Is it permitted to use calumny in order to prevent an injury? Rev. Brooke Herford intimates that Catholic priests regard this as a lawful means. He tells a wild-goose story about a clergyman who “had gone over to Rome and became a priest, and after some years in the Catholic priesthood quietly came back into Protestantism. He told me that he had been at a confer-

ence of priests where the question proposed was: 'Supposing a priest apostatizes, and one of his fellow priests in order to block his way starts a report of his having been guilty of some scandalous crime, how ought such a falsehood to be treated.' Some laid down that it should be treated as a venial transgression, others that it was no wrong, not a single one strongly and clearly condemned it." Now, we cannot here refrain from addressing a common-sense rebuke to Rev. Mr. Herford. Why has he given no indications as to time, place, or person concerned? They might have been awkward we see at once, but Rev. Mr. Herford should have recollect ed that in civilized society we regard as dishonest and "of anti-social instincts" the man who launches vague and general accusations, leaving no clue whereby the sufferers may refute or at least verify them, and in this case there was special demand for precision and accuracy, as the charge made is, on the face of it, improbable. Remember we are required to believe that in this assembly of priests there was not one acquainted with principles advanced in the most elementary text-books of moral theology—books which in all human probability these very men had studied during a course of three or four years. For it is an universally admitted principle that for no reason and under no pretext whatever, whether of private or public good, can it ever be lawful to employ calumny, and when on occasion an insignificant number of writers advanced the opinion that to retort with calumny in self-defense against a calumniator was not a mortal sin, they were condemned by Innocent XI. Prop. 44. "Probabile est non peccare mortaliter qui imponit falsum crimen alteri ut suam justitiam et honorem defendat." This is not a statement open to question. The matter has been on official record for some two centuries, and if before journeying to Boston to retail the anecdotes of this Anglican clergyman, Rev. Mr. Herford had picked up a common Catholic manual of theology, *e.g.*, Gury, he would probably have spoken more reservedly—at least we like to think so, for it is not our business to assail his good faith as he has assailed ours.

And there are pious frauds abroad, too! For example, Catholics actually baptize pagan infants dangerously ill, and do it, moreover, without, or in spite of, their parent's knowledge. Here Rev. Mr. Herford introduces into his discourse the story of a certain missionary in China. He might, and, in fact,

should, have gone farther; should have added that this practice exists since the days of St. Francis Xavier, has been approved by the Holy See, has been encouraged by the founding of a confraternity pledged to promote it, and that this confraternity, the Sodalitas Angelica, has been enriched by special indulgences. Let us see upon what principles all this is based. They are three in number. First, according to the commonly received Catholic doctrine (opposed by Durandus, Paludanus, and Catharinus) baptism conferred upon infants without or in spite of parental wishes is valid, and gives them "a better standing before Almighty God than if they had died as they were." Second, by reason of respect for parental authority, as well as for fear of profaning the sacrament, it is taught to be, in general, unlawful to baptize children without their parent's consent. Third, when said infants are in proximate danger of death they may be lawfully baptized, since the fear of profanation is removed, and the extreme necessity of the little ones must count for more than the parental displeasure. According to Rev. Mr. Herford's view, Rome has, in this respect, "degenerated from the more ancient doctrine." His opinion might have been different had he chanced to turn to a page of St. Augustine (*De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, c. 22), or of the Code of Justinian (lib. I., tit. XI., c. 10), or of the Nomocanon (lib. 4, c. 4, etc.), or even had he been fortunate enough to light upon what was written by Bingham (lib. II., c. 4, § 18), or by Isaac Vossius (*De Baptismo* disp. 15). What Mr. Herford adds about this giving weight "to the answer of modern liberalism, that we repudiate the claim of the Church to the overlordship of men's souls," scarce concerns us. We are not now interested in this modern liberalism, which has tossed overboard all sense of the supernatural. It is more to our liking to leave the verdict to those who still possess solid, Christian notions about original sin, justification, and salvation; men who do not profess to believe that religion is an inductive study, and that sociology is able to dispute the claim of theology to be queen of the sciences.

Rev. Mr. Brooke Herford ventures, we will say rather dares, to affirm that "Catholicity officially sanctions such misrepresentations of history as its own best scholars are ashamed of." Such a statement called for proof, or required that indications be given as to the falsities officially sanctioned. Was the lecturer thinking of the legends of the *Breviary* and some other points

so much discussed at the time of the Vatican Council? Surely it is too late to resurrect these things; we refer interested parties to the numerous contemporary refutations of Janus. And who, may we ask, are the best scholars full of confusion at the action of their mother, the Church? Are they, perchance, Döllinger, Huber, Reusch? Or are they men like Hergenröther, Pitra, Hefele, De Rossi, Duchesne, and Pastor? Far from sanctioning historical falsehoods, Leo XIII., in his Letter to Cardinals De Luca, Pitra, and Hergenröther on Historical Studies, teaches that "the first law of history is never to speak falsely; its second, never to conceal truth: *Primam esse, historiae legem ne quid falsi dicere audeat, deinde ne quid veri non audeat; ne qua suspicio gratiae sit in scribendo, ne qua simultatis.*" There may be among Catholics passionate writers who have forgotten the laws of history as thus laid down, but we fear no imputation of rashness in affirming that Catholics may, in this regard, welcome comparison with their adversaries. For impartiality, no less than for erudition, Baronius is a hundred times superior to the Centuriators, whose Senior, the apostate Matthaeus Flacius, wrote better with his knife than with his pen. The Benedictines have published countless folios of documents and we have still to hear the first charges against their honesty; in fact modern scientific history almost dates from the *De Re Diplomatica* of the incomparable Benedictine Mabillon. Our great controversialists, Stapleton, Du Perron, Bellarmine, never found them in the humiliating position filled by Duplessis-Mornay at the conference of Fontainebleau.¹ People do not, as a rule, cite Froude and Motley as models of strict impartiality, though no one has yet refuted the work on the Reformation, written by Döllinger while still a Catholic, nor the work of Janssen on the "History of the German People," nor that of Kervyn de Lettenhove, "Les Huguenots et les Gueux." For school manuals the instructions given by the Holy Father are that these manuals be compiled from scientific and trustworthy works, so that the youthful readers can obtain, without any danger, the true knowledge of facts. If all the text-books employed in our schools do not come up to this ideal, at least they are not inferior to those used by the sects. Rev. Mr. Herford affords us proof of this, for his whole discourse betrays an ignorance of historic facts so inexcusable that it certainly reflects little honor

¹Oeuvres du Cardinal du Perron, Paris, 1622, in fol. vol. III., p. 86.

on his own training. The motives that influenced the Dudley foundation offer another proof. If we were to believe Mr. Herford, Dudley and Protestants generally imagined the Church to have encouraged the Duke of Alva's cruelties; as a matter of fact, the letters of the Belgian bishops and of the University of Louvain¹ demonstrate the energetic opposition of the Church to such cruelties. Though well acquainted with Alva's cruelties, he appeared quite ignorant of any devastations made by the Gueux of Flanders², of the cruelties practiced by Calvinists in Holland³, or of persecutions by German Lutherans.⁴ Dudley believed the Church responsible for the murder of William of Orange, who really was executed by order of his King and according to a principle of public law then recognized, though, on the other hand, he seemed quite unaware that the assassination of the celebrated Duke of Guise had been decided upon in a Calvinistic conventicle, approved by Coligny, hurried on by the declamations of Theodore de Beza, and perpetrated in the name of the Protestant faith by Poltrot.⁵ In America, when the barbarian Indians, from time to time, massacred the English colonists, it was calumniously reported that the attacks were instigated by the Jesuits. We would never finish, if we attempted to show in detail the want of veracity with which past events, as well as contemporaneous facts are represented. For the rest, it is beneath our dignity to pay attention to the silly narratives and ridiculous tales that ornament the reverend gentleman's discourse,—a conversion in an hospital, a Catholic married to a Protestant, who, at the moment of death, commanded his daughter to be brought up in the Catholic faith, having promised the contrary to his wife; a young man who seduced a young girl and would not marry her unless she were baptized; a Catholic, who preferred to confide money to a minister rather than trust his priest (when the bank was the proper place for it).

¹ The letter of the Belgian bishops is still preserved in the Archives of Simancas. The University's letter can be read in the *Annuaire de l'Université de Louvain*, 1856, p. 294, and in the *Bulletin de l'Academie Royale de Belgique*, tom. xxii.

² See Kervyn de Lettenhove, op. cit., vol. I, pag. 360.

³ Ib., vol. III, p. 479.

⁴ Janssen, vol. III, 208, 300, and passim (French ed.).

⁵ Lettres d'Étienne Pasquier, bk. iv, c. 20; Letter of Chantonay (agent of Philip II.) February 27, 1563 (Archives de Bruxelles); Forbes, *Public Transactions*, vol. II, p. 329. See in general Kervyn de Lettenhove, op. cit. It is well to remember that the murder of the Duke of Guise took place in 1563, some ten years before the massacre of Saint Bartholomew. Thomas Smith, the English ambassador to France, wrote to Queen Elizabeth at the time that a day would come when Coligny would be assassinated to expiate the murder of the Duke of Guise. (Record Office, State Papers, 1563, cal. p. 203.)

V.

Such disconnected, irrelevant, and farraginous material; such trivial and unsupported objections; such weak ranging along the solid front of the most logical, self-conscious, and intellectual of existing societies, will not destroy its claims to be the sole inheritor of the doctrine of Jesus Christ and His Apostles. While deplored their errors, Catholics respect and admire those great theological minds which have flourished in Protestantism—Leibnitz, Butler, Paley, Guizot, Chalmers, Channing, Schaff, and others. It rouses all one's manhood to have to deal with men like Gladstone, as Cardinal Newman did, or with Jurieu and Claude, as Bossuet. The game is worth the candle, for a great intellectual booty,—the allegiance of new millions and the confirmation of ancient loyalty,—await the victor. Such contests are not fought over twice in a generation, and the Church never fails to approach them with becoming gravity and prudence; but we confess to downright impatience when insignificant minds challenge the whole apparatus of warfare, as though the Terror and the Thunderer were sent out to smash the cockleshells of some puny enemy. Nor would we have paid more than passing attention to the bundle of innuendoes, errors, misrepresentations, and irrelevancies that make up the discourse of Rev. Mr. Herford, were it not for the platform whence he spoke,—one of the foremost of modern schools, progressive, sympathetic, and elevated beyond sectarian prejudice and bitterness. What a world of difference between the discourse of the Right Reverend Rector of the Catholic University of America and that of Rev. Mr. Herford! The one marked an uplifting of our unhappy differences into a calm region of mutual respect and toleration, where men may move upon the plane of honest doubt, inquiry, exposition, and explanation. The other marks a corresponding descent into the tangled purlieus of the wretched politico-religious history of Europe from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. One was kindly, philosophical, American, adorned with every charm of oratory, and calculated by its Catholic suavity to exemplify, in the person of one of her most prominent leaders, the true and authoritative positions of the Catholic Church in this time and this land,—positions which are thereby and necessarily, the positions of the millions of her children, since it is as true of the Catholic Church to-day as in

the time of St. Ignatius of Antioch, nearly eighteen centuries ago, that wherever the bishop is there is the Catholic Church. The other opened up antiquated and exploded controversies, foreign to us in time, literature, political and social conditions, capable only of disturbing that mutual good-will necessary for the common weal,—controversies once victoriously ended for Catholicism, and whose only real *raison d'être* perished in the cataclysm of the French Revolution.

The Dudley foundation is, no doubt, a delicate inheritance, for it is based on exegesis now recognized by every scientific scripturist as false; on historical assumptions that are hotly disputed, to say the least; on a defunct state of public opinion, and on a conception of University work, life, and aim, either false in itself or long abandoned by the proud school at Cambridge—no unworthy peer of her island homonym. If the lectures are to be continued, the equitable and logical outcome would be that Harvard should make itself the common battle-ground or theater whereon the pros and the cons of three centuries of religious warfare should once more be threshed out, and should raise above the entry of the venerable institution the Virgilian warning to all intending combatants:

Tros Tyriusve mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Theology.

Conscience and Law, or Principles of Human Conduct, by William Humphrey,
S. J. London, Thomas Baker; New York, Benziger Bros., 1896, pp. 226.

We have here an English manual that furnishes a succinct and clear knowledge of the principles of human conduct, in six chapters, entitled respectively: Human Responsibility, Conscience, Law, Dispensations and Privileges, Justice and Right, Restitution. How many guides of souls have wished for just such a book that might be safely put into the hands of persons anxious or troubled or charged with the care of others? For example, the elementary notions of ethics, human motives and acts, the voluntary and the involuntary, concupiscence, concern, fear,—the object, circumstances, ends, morality, meritoriousness of human acts—are so vaguely understood or not at all. The brief exposition of Catholic philosophical and theological doctrine on Responsibility contained in the first fifty pages of this work remedies this ignorance. The two chapters on Conscience and Law are the backbone of the work,—conscience being treated as the *internal* and law as the *external* rule of human conduct. They give the title to the work, and are alone worth its price. What is conscience, how differing from the natural law? What is practical and speculative, doubt, opinion, suspicion? What is the rule of rightness? How are we to form our conscience, that is, to acquire a practically certain conscience? Then again, what is law and how does it differ from precept, statute, counsel, permission? How promulgated and interpreted? What is custom, and how does it become binding as law? What are penal laws, local and universal laws, and who are the subjects of laws? What is domicile and quasidomicile? How do laws cease to exist, and who has the right to interpret them? Here we have a long series of questions that arise daily in human intercourse, and the correct answers to which are neither more nor less than the very basic principles of human conduct, private and social. In similar manner the chapters on Dispensation and Privileges, Justice and Right, and Restitution are expositions of practical everyday theology that need to be conned and mastered by every

Catholic who cares to obey intelligently the Church, and by every non-Catholic who cares to understand the motives of Catholic submission. Father Humphrey has prepared a catechism of Christian conduct that will go far to dispel the ignorance of multitudes who are ignorant through misfortune of education or birth or inherited prejudice. It would make the basis of admirable instructions in the churches or in the schools, for it contains the marrow of that magnificent system of government by which the Church guides the souls of men to their last end. It reveals also the high dignity of the Catholic theory of life and conduct, and is one of the best apologies that could be put into the hands of our separated brethren. Whoever would understand the enormous progress in the science of Catholic morality let him read the "Two Ways of Light and Darkness" in the "Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles," and the "Shepherd of Hermas," and then this other manual of human conduct, the product of a similar general need at over eighteen centuries of distance, and itself only the essential framework of Catholic practical theology.

Atlas Scripturae Sacrae, Decem tabulae geographicae cum indice locorum Scripturæ Sacrae vulgo edit., Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum et ethniconrum, Auctore Dr. Rich v. Reiss, Canonico Capitular, Rottenburg. B. Herder, Freiburg im Baden; B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1896. Price, \$2.75.

The ten maps that make up this book are of the highest interest to the students of Scripture and Ancient History. They are I. Egypt in the Time of the Patriarchs. II. Arabia Petræa and Chanaan at the time of the return of the Israelites from Egypt, the territory around Mt. Sinai. III. Palestine in the time of the Judges and the Kings, the Kingdom of Solomon and David. IV. Chanaan, Syria, Assyria, and Babylonia, according to the monuments of Assyrian literature. V. Assyria and Babylonia, with the cities of Ninive and Babylon. VI. Palestine in the time of Jesus Christ and the Apostles; the Sea of Galilee. VII. Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, Italy, in the Apostolic times. VIII. Jerusalem, Under the Kings; After the Captivity; Under the Asmonæan house; in the time of Vespasian, of Hadrian, of Constantine; from the fourth to the seventh century; the "Eremus" or Desert of Jerusalem in the same period (Lower Jordan and Dead Sea). IX. Modern Jerusalem. X. Modern Palestine.

An alphabetical list of the localities, with references to their places in Scripture, and other succinct explanations, complete this very valuable Scriptural geography. It is gotten up with all attainable scientific accuracy, as might be well expected when the house of Herder sends forth work of this nature, for which it has been long and favorably known. Every seminary, college, convent, and parochial school ought to possess this indispensable help to the knowledge of Bible and Early Church History.

Catholic Doctrine and Discipline Simply Explained, by Philip Bold. Revised and in part edited by Father Eyre, S. J. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. Benziger Bros., New York, 1896. Pp. 340.

In fifty-eight chapters the author of this volume explains the Commandments of God and the Church, Grace, Merit, Predestination, Prayer, the Sacraments, and Sacramentals, the Symbolism and Decorations of Our Churches, and the Administration of the Sacraments. The work contains much Catholic doctrine well digested and set forth in good readable style. There is a vein of sterling sense running through it all ; the positive expository element dominates in the choice of matter and in the arrangement of the arguments. Altogether it is a work that proceeds somewhat on the lines of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and might be placed with excellent effect in the hands of anyone desirous of mastering the essentials of Catholicism. If there were added in the beginning a small bibliography of the best accessible works on the special subjects treated, it would greatly enhance the value of the work. A good index enables the reader to find all the information it contains on any given point.

Meditationum et Contemplationum S. Ignatii de Loyola Puncta, Libri Exercitiorum textum delignerter secutus explicavit Franciscus de Hummelauer, S. J. Freiburg im Baden ; Herder, 1896 ; H. Herder, St. Louis pp. 435. \$1.25.

This new edition of the text of the Exercises of St. Ignatius will be welcomed, not only for their intrinsic merit, but for the handy and attractive form of the book, especially the clear and artistic printing and the portable octavo size. An introduction of considerable length explains the nexus of the Meditations with one another and with the Contemplations.

The Great Commentary of Cornelius a Lapide, *I Corinthians*, Translated and edited by W. F. Cobb, D. D. London: John Hodges, 1 vol., 8vo, pp. 408, 1890.

This English translation of the Scriptural Commentaries of Cornelius a Lapide or Van den Steen (1566-1637) has reached its seventh volume. The previous six contain the Commentaries on the Four Gospels. The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans are in press. Thus the most practical part of the Commentary which the learned Jesuit wrote, on nearly all the books of the Old and New Testament, is within reach of every English reader, who may enjoy to the full the earnest and unaffected piety of the most famous of modern commentators. Inferior to Maldonatus in his commentary on the Gospels, and to Estius in that on the Epistles of St. Paul, accused of excessive and exhausting lengthiness, Cornelius a Lapide remains forever the *thesaurus* of preachers. His great erudition, his patristic knowledge, and his numerous anecdotal illustrations make him the beloved friend of men who have to preach with great frequency and on many themes. His knowledge of the Oriental languages is not very great, and he is often far from strictly scientific in his treatment of the letter of the Scripture; nevertheless, in spite of Richard Simon's rather moderate praise, he is still a favorite guide in the study of the Word of God.

In treating of the Epistles of St. Paul, he tells us that his scope was "*solide, breviter, methodice, et clare tradere sensum maxime genuinum et literalem harum Epistolarum, uti et reliquae deinceps Scripturae; ideoque ex textu graeco, hebraeo et syro atque ex patribus ea proferre quae sensum hunc genuinum vel demonstrant vel illustrant.*"

The book is gotten up in handy octavo style, on excellent paper, is printed in clear type, with topical headings to each page and italicized catchwords at the beginning of each paragraph. It deserves a place in every priest's library and would make excellent spiritual reading in any Catholic family.

Indulgences, their Nature, Origin, and Development, by Alexius M. Lépicier, D. D., O. S. M. I. vol. Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co., London, 1895.

This volume is from the pen of Professor Lépicier, the distinguished successor of Cardinal Satolli in the Propaganda. It appeared early last year, but was hitherto unavoidably crowded out of consideration. We hasten to bestow upon it the recognition it deserves.

Indulgences have proved a veritable rock of scandal to so many minds that he who would undertake the treatment of this subject must bring to it a largeness of view and an abundance of sound principles to meet the stock-in-trade objections urged against it. Not that the doctrine in itself presents any very complicated problem for solution. Its elements, on the contrary, are quite simple. But erroneous points of view, heightened considerably by prejudice and so-called historical abuses, have put the whole question in a most unfavorable light. Of all this, none could be better aware than Professor Lépicier, whose long experience in England enables him to grapple with his subject under its most uninviting aspects, and certainly not without a very pleasing degree of success.

The nature and consequences of sin are clearly defined; the superabundant merits of Christ and the saints are dwelt upon suggestively, and the guilt of debt attaching to moral faults is brought out with precision and accuracy. The origin of the name "Indulgence" itself contains many items of interest for the reader, who is made to see in it a military term used by the Romans and afterwards appropriated by the Church to signify a higher and holier truth. The word *indulgentia*, "indulgence," was somewhat akin to our English "political amnesty," just as "statio" *vigilia*, "parochus," etc., have found in our language a series of terms unmistakably of kindred origin and meaning. The views of the Fathers on Indulgences, the growth of the same through successive periods of history, their conditions, applicability, and abuses are dwelt upon at length in successive chapters.

The work is orderly and the style is a mosaic of quotations from the sacred text, showing a marked familiarity with the Old and New Testament writers. The part played by Tradition and Scripture in the determination of this definite belief constitutes a pleasing feature of the treatise. Withal, it is very readable, very philosophic, and cannot fail to supplement a priest's instructions on this much abused doctrine. It speaks for itself and is its own apology.

Philosophy.

Nourrisson, Voltaire et le Voltairianisme, Paris, Lethielleux, 1896, 8° pp. 670.

Another book on Voltaire! It seems like bringing coals to Newcastle to add one more volume to the stately mass of literature which has for its object—

L'enfant gâté du siècle qu'il gâta.

Nevertheless, we could ill do without this work of M. Nourrisson. It is written directly from the writings of the philosopher of Ferney, and is more than an authentic portrait of the creator of the French Revolution,—is a documentary sketch of the intellectual life of French society in the middle of the eighteenth century. In ten chapters M. Nourrisson describes the youth of François Arouet, who took at an early age, for unknown reasons, the name of Voltaire, then the years of his liaison with Mme. du Châtelet at Cirey, his sojourn at Potsdam with the great Frederick, his settlement at Ferney, and the tremendous activity he displayed thenceforth in the miniature state which he managed to construct for himself on the confines of France, Italy, and Switzerland. Under the captions of Country, Humanity, and Tolerance, M. Nourrisson has collected from the writings of Voltaire the true principles and aims of the world's most destructive genius,—his selfishness and cruel, besetting avarice; his personal cowardice and endless refined malice; the pomp and glitter of his written phrase, and the more than ordinary meanness of his private life,—in a word, the huge hypocrisy of this most gifted child of the eighteenth century,—are all in these pages, with inexhaustible evidences over his own name. In the second part of his work M. Nourrisson discusses in eight chapters the peculiar philosophy known as Voltairianism, in its relations to philosophy itself, to the great philosophers, and in its concepts of Ideas, the Soul, Liberty, God, Morality, and Politics. In these chapters we recognize the skilful hand of the historian of the philosophies of St. Augustin, Leibnitz, Bossuet, and Pascal, and readily yield to the author the right to the devise which he has chosen: *Ego te intus et in cute novi.* (Pers. III, 30).

If we leave aside his careful education by the Jesuits, the frivolous character of the age, and the shattered condition of France, there are two things which help us to understand the ascendancy of Voltaire over the minds of his contemporaries,—his capacity for work and his genius for satire. With him work was a passion. He was surely possessed by a towering ambition, though his estate and his timidity did not allow him to advance in the political world in spite of habitual cringing and flattery. By an unbroken campaign of labor this wonderful man gained an empire over the minds of men precisely as a generation later the indefatigable Napoleon wrested to himself that empire over

the nations of Europe which was forever the secret desire of Voltaire,

"Le travail est mon Dieu, lui seul regit le monde
Il est l'âme de tout."

Alone or in company, at home and abroad, in prison or out, in the midst of dissipation and on tedious journeys, his active mind never rested, and the secretaries he employed were frequently exhausted by the incredible demands he made upon them. Besides countless poetical effusions, he wrote two epic poems, fifty tragedies, comedies, and operas, many odes, epistles, and satires, besides histories, dialogues, discourses, dictionaries, innumerable dissertations on literature, the natural sciences, philosophy, theology, legislation, criminal justice, etc. His correspondence fills many volumes; unedited portions of it are yet discovered from time to time; much of it was purposely destroyed, e. g., the letters to Mme. du Châtelet,—more of it was never recovered from the parties to whom it was addressed. He was, moreover, from youth a close and exacting man of business, and he acquired in his long life an enormous fortune, the basis of which was laid by successful army contracts given him by a government which he never ceased to ridicule and even to betray. This endless labor was all directed to himself,—his personal well-being was the aim of every action and the mainspring of his conduct. Egotistic beyond measure, he suffered extremely from the talents and successes of others,—witness his bitter rivalries with Rousseau and Fréron, and his jealousy and ill-treatment of Buffon.

With the *Ce'l* satire has ever been the most effective of weapons, and the skill and experience of a hundred generations of bardic lampoonists seem to have been concentrated in the soul of Voltaire, otherwise so well aided by inclination training and surroundings, to become the biting lash of a multitude of men whom he at once hated, feared, envied, and despised. It was said of the old Celtic bards that they could raise blisters on the King's cheek with their scornful song. Voltaire, indeed, caused the cheeks of churchmen and statesmen to burn and their ears to tingle with the merciless mockery of his pen.

Voltaire, le serpent, le doute, l'ironie,
Avec son oeil de flamme il espionne, et rit.
Oh ! tremble ! Ce sophiste a sondé bien des fanges !
Oh ! tremble ! Ce faux sage a perdu bien des anges !¹

¹Victor Hugo, *Les Rayons et Les Ombres* (V-VI).

Who does not know the unparalleled apostrophe of Joseph de Maistre: "Paris crowned Voltaire; Sodom would have banished him. Midway between admiration and horror, there are times when I would like to erect a statue to him by the hand of the executioner. Look at that abject forehead that no sentiment of *pudeur* ever flushed; those two extinct craters, in which luxury and hatred seem yet to simmer; that mouth,—nay, that frightful gash (*rictus*) that stretches from ear to ear; those lips light pressed by cruel malice, ever ready to burst open in tones of blasphemy or of sarcasm."¹

I borrow one more characteristic profile from the book of M. Nourrisson, the lines of the poet Rolla:

"Dors tu content, Voltaire, et ton hideux sourire,
Voltige-t-il encore sur tes os décharnés ?
Ton siècle était, dit-on, trop jeune pour te lire ;
Le nôtre doit te plaire, et tes hommes sont nés ;
Il est tombé sur nous un édifice immense
Que de tes larges mains tu sapais nuit et jour."

The controverted questions of the manner of his death and the final disposition of his remains are equitably treated by M. Nourrisson, who gives the pro and con on each side, and abstains from any final judgment. Voltaire could scarcely have objected to the epitaph which Rousseau is said to have written for him :

"Plus bel esprit que grand génie,
Sans foi, sans moeurs, et sans vertu,
Il est mort, comme il a vécu
Couvert de gloire et d'infamie."

In fact, he wrote his own epitaph when quite young in the Epitre au Maréchal de Villars (1721). I transcribe it as a specimen of that scoffing attitude which he never abandoned towards whatever was venerable and holy to his fellow-men :

"Si quelque jour, moi chétif
J'allais passer le noir esquif,
Je n'aurais bien qu'une vile bière;
Deux prêtres s'en iraient gaiement
Porter ma figure légère,
Et la loger mesquinement
Dans le coin d'un cimetière.
Mes nièces, au lieu de prières,
Et mon Janseniste de frère,

¹ Soirées (IV.) de St. Petersburg.

Riraient à mon enterrement;
Et j'aurais l'honneur seulement
Que quelque muse médisante
M'affublerait pour monument
D'une épitaphe impertinente."

Scarce more than a hundred years have passed since Paris apotheosized the living Voltaire, and we remember yet the almost national solemnity of the burial of his nineteenth century counterpart, Ernest Renan. There is something in universal fame, in cosmopolitan glory which sweeps up irresistibly the affections of the Frank and blinds him, especially in periods of political self-repression, to aught else than the renown of France, even through those of her children who have

"Sought and found, by dangerous roads,
A path to perpetuity of fame."

But in that hundred years of epic experience and vicissitudes, how much has France gained by the counsels and maxims, by the life and example of Voltaire and Renan? One thing she has surely lost in great measure, if not irreparably,—the element of faith,—that stable anchor so needed by the mobile, impressionable nature of the Celt, that universal and all-sufficient motive which once bound in indissoluble unity and affection the Gallo-Roman, the Sicamber, the Burgundian, and the men of Aquitaine,—which lifted mediaeval France out of the wreck of the Carlovingian state, and gave her the proud empery of taste and art and learning,—which created and justified the crusades, and held France from disruption in the downfall of Catholic Christendom. Corroding doubt, unholy cynicism, scurrilous frivolity are eating away the vitals of the world's proudest nationality, of a people among whom the Catholic idea flourished for centuries without hindrance on the most receptive soul. Voltaire and Renan, the noisy "Christmoque" and the suave and elegant destroner of the Man-God! They have moved from the heart of France the cornerstone that St. Rémi planted in the Salic law,—the belief in the divinity of Jesus and the respect for His Spouse; hence the edifice of the Catholic ages is straining at all points, and crises and convulsions succeed one another, and men stand aghast, as during the pale and threatening calm that precedes the bursting of the hurricane. Nevertheless, there is a mighty power of regeneration, an incalculable spiritual elasticity in this people which does nothing by halves. The sun of faith may yet

again dawn upon the land of Clovis and Rémi, of Hincmar and Suger, of Abelard and Bernard, of St. Louis and Joan of Arc. When it does, the world will follow, for such is the law of history, never falsified since the day of Tolbiac, that France is the pulse of the intellectual movement and the unfailing index of the deepest feeling of mankind.

The Helpful Science.

This is a neat little volume, published mostly for American readers, by the well-known English philosopher and scientist, St. George Mivart. It is a straightforward and convincing acknowledgment of the necessity of Metaphysics, which is, in the author's judgment, "the helpful science."

The writer's object is to call attention to the fact that modern speculation, if persisted in along lines already faulty, must needs lead to the sterilization of thought and the abandonment of scientific pursuits as void of requisite foundation and certainty. The views of Descartes, Hume, Mill, and Spencer are carefully considered, and the worth of the different systems of "realism" pertinently discussed. A disciple of the latter school of thinkers for some years, and hemmed in, as he says himself, by a labyrinth of difficulties, out of which, for a while, he saw no avenue of escape, Mivart simply tells the story of his own philosophic conversion, and reviews the healthy principles by which it was brought about. He pleads the cause of Metaphysics with a view to obtain for it a favorable hearing among his fellows. The facts to which he calls attention are the certainty of existence, the validity of memory and of reasoning, as well as the objective and intuitive evidence of first principles. For each and every one of these distinct chapters are vouchers. He rejects mediate and hypothetical realism and declares the proper system to be that of Intellectualism—that is, a critical intuitive realism. He points out very clearly that modern speculation should not have taken Descartes' assumption of the impossibility of direct intercourse between mind and matter as a fact beyond any questioning, a principle to be erected into a dogmatic and ungainsayable assurance. On the contrary, so far from being a fact, this impossibility of immediate intercourse between spirit and matter is contradicted by consciousness. There "*is*" intercourse between them, and this intercourse is immediate. The fault of Descartes was one of method. He assumed an idea

and made facts make good its passage. He tried to discover how this intercourse takes place. Mivart waives all question as to how such connection may be realized, limiting himself to the consideration of the actual fact that such is, in very truth, the case.

Admitting the Cartesian assumption and following it out along its logical lines of development, we will eventually, to use his own words, "be landed in universal scepticism." Why question the validity of memory, he avers, when to question it means to implicitly admit its validity? We are supposing our memory to be valid in the very processes by which we would overthrow its validity, and thus we are of those who build more wisely than it is given them to know. What incentive to study, what stimulus for scientific pursuit if the tools we use are not fitted for the purpose? Unless we can know something with certainty, science is a myth and knowledge a bundle of ideas, concerning whose worth we can know nothing. One thought must certainly strike all to-day who think and feel, that unless we speculate in conformity with science we are but sapping the very sources of human knowledge. If, while science wends its way to further and further conclusions, we are engaged in questioning the validity of its starting points and shrouding them in doubt and mystery, and all because of an assumption which is adverse to fact, we certainly can hope for no good from an attempt to sterilize the noblest efforts.

The volume is popularly written and entertaining. None can fail to profit by its perusal and gather a strong rejoinder to the scepticism of the day from one who knows the secrets of its strength and weakness, and who exposes both fearlessly and in the interest of truth.

History, Travel, Institutions.

Outlines of Church History, for Schools, Colleges, and Seminaries, by Rev. H. Wedewier, D.D., professor in the Royal Colleges of Wiesbaden, translated and supplemented by Rev. John Klute. Catholic Universe Pub. Co., Cleveland, 1890.

This modest volume might well be in the hands of every Catholic. In 247 octavo pages it contains an accurate summary of the entire history of the Church, and its moderate price puts it within the reach of every one. The incredible evolution of the Sunday newspaper and the popular review makes it necessary

for the average Catholic to be well instructed with regard to the main events of Church history, to understand the difficulties and trials of the Spouse of Christ at various critical periods, and to know that the Holy Ghost reveals Himself forever to the Church in guidance, illumination, strength, and consolation.

A Visit to Europe and the Holy Land, by Rev. H. F. Fairbanks. Fourth edition, with illustrations; Benziger Bros., New York, 1896, pp. 468.

These notes of a clergyman's journey to Europe and the Holy Land enjoy a well-deserved popularity. They are written in an easy and pleasing style, and cannot fail to entertain and instruct the reader.

Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, edited by Herbert B. Adams. Fourteenth series.

1. Slavery and Servitude in the Colony of North Carolina, by John Spencer Bassett, Ph. D., iv-v, pp. 86.
2. Representation in Virginia, by Julian A. C. Chandler, A. M., vi-vii, pp. 83.

Professor Bassett in the five chapters of his monograph describes "the introduction of slavery," "the legal status of slavery," "the religious and social life of the slaves," "the free negro and Indian slaves," and "white servitude." A very serious difficulty presents itself at the outset to the historian of early slavery in the colonies, because of the scarcity of historical records dealing with slavery. "The lives of the American slaves were without annals, and to a large extent without conscious purpose. To get the story of their existence there is no other way than to follow the tracks they have made in the history of another people. This will be a slow and, in a sense, an unsatisfactory labor. At best it can give but a partial picture of the real life of the slaves, yet it can give all there is to give." And so the historian "must be content to gather up as many facts as can be found and to regret that circumstances have made it impossible to obtain a more complete story." The legal status of the slave is, of course, pretty fully recorded in the legislative and judicial records of the slave-holding colonies. But the social life of the slave, and his social rather than his legal relation to the dominant race, are perhaps the most important elements to be considered in an institutional study, and it is unfortunate that just here the historical evidences are most meagre and unsatisfactory.

Out of such fragmentary and confessedly insufficient material,

Professor Bassett has reconstructed as complete a picture as is possible, and has contributed an excellent study on a subject of importance in institutional history. The monograph shows careful research, the material is well arranged, and the style is terse and clear. For the most part Professor Bassett has confined himself strictly to presenting the results of his research, and has refrained from discussing any of the many aspects of his subject. At the outset, however, he has condensed considerable philosophy into the first few pages of his study, and it is a philosophy that seems a little inclined to handle this "peculiar institution" with somewhat of gentleness and to regard it as a necessary phase in the evolution of the black race. "To have come to America as a slave was not without an advantage to the negro" (p. 11). "The same reasoning which in all social systems recognizes the expediency of placing the child under the dominant direction of his more experienced parent, will be effective in showing that in the days of the earliest contact of the white man and the black man it was a useful thing for the latter that he took his first lessons in civilization in the rigorous school of slavery" (p. 12). This is not so apparent that the mere statement carries conviction with it, and as Professor Bassett has not further developed this interesting thesis we may at least withhold our assent to it until the logic of events has demonstrated it more clearly than it has yet done. There has of late been a tendency in some quarters to develop a retrospective philosophy which justifies our former negro slavery as a providential means that was to work out grand results for the black race. When the Republic of Liberia was first set up, there were those who, believing they discerned the shadows of coming events, saw in Liberia the grain from whence were to issue forces destined to Christianize and civilize the races of darkest Africa. From America the emancipated slave was to return to his ancestral jungles as a light-bearer to his still benighted brethren. But this prediction and hope has not yet been justified. Nor is there any reason to believe that they will be. European civilization has drawn a cordon around the borders of Africa and is fast closing in from nearly every side. In its progress it will probably either civilize or exterminate the black race, and thus bids fair to assume the role that the prophets foresaw for Liberia. Beyond the influence, therefore, which it exerted on the few millions of negroes that are in America our slavery has produced no results on the blacks. It cannot, in

the face of events, be magnified into a factor in the evolution of a race. At best its influence has affected only a small and an isolated fraction of a race and is apparently destined to be without effect on the race at large. It could probably be maintained that in most instances the slavery of the past was a necessary phase in the evolution of our race at large. But, flattering as would be the unction, we can hardly urge that this was so in the specific case of negro slavery in our colonies. Had the colonist and the negro come face to face on our soil, as did colonist and Indian, then it might have been maintained that the natural order of development would have required that the one race make slaves or corpses of the other. But the two races did not thus come face to face. The soils they occupied were separated by thousands of miles of rolling waters, and whilst the conditions in the South undoubtedly invited negro slavery and the spirit of the age permitted it, yet it is no more true that it was a necessary phase in the evolution of either race than that the cramps or the measles are necessary phases in the development of a child.

But whilst we disagree with some implications of Professor Bassett's philosophy, we have the fullest appreciation of the value and merit of his study.

2. "The monograph represents a few chapters of a larger work on the Constitutional History of Virginia, which the writer has in preparation. It treats only of representation in the State Legislature, and not of Federal representation. Representation is of fundamental importance in our system of government, and every historical contribution to the literature of the subject is timely and welcome, and Mr. Chandler's study is a careful one of much merit. It brings to light an interesting history of a long struggle over the question of representation between two sections of the State whose interests were often conflicting. The unequal distribution of the slave population on the two sides of the Blue Ridge seems to have rendered it impossible to agree on any basis of representation. Summing up, Mr. Chandler gives the following as the systems of representation that have existed in Virginia :

1. Representation by settlements or plantations with no definite number of representatives from each settlement.

2. Parish and county representation without a fixed number of delegates from either the parishes or the counties.
3. Representation by counties only, two representatives from each county, neither more nor less, whether the counties were large or small.
4. Representation to the College of William and Mary, in accordance with the English custom of allowing representation to the Universities.
5. Borough representation, granted by the town charters, or by an act of the general assembly.
6. From 1830 to 1851, an arbitrary system of representation without a constitutional basis.
7. Beginning with 1852, another arbitrary system of representation to continue until 1865, when the legislature should make a reapportionment.
8. Representation based on the registered voters of 1867, with a provision for reapportionment after every census, but with no constitutional basis for such reapportionments.
9. Representation apportioned in 1878 and 1891 with reference to population and county boundaries.

History of Monetary Systems, by Alexander Del Mar; London, Effingham Wilson; New York, Brentano, 1895; pp. xxxix-511.

In the preface to this valuable work, the author tells us that its scope "includes a recension of my former chapters on India, Greece, and Rome; a continuation of the Roman history from the monetary systems of Augustus to the downfall of the Empire, and an examination of the Merovingian and Carlovingian systems, the Moslem system, the systems of Britain from the earliest times to the reign of Edward III., and the systems of Saxony, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Germany, and the Argentine Republic." Special attention is paid to the historical development of the "relative value of gold and silver, the origin, nature, tendency, and influence of this ratio and its amenability to legal control," also to the origin and progress of Private Coinage. The general views of the author as to the principles of money are set forth in the following paragraph:

"These principles of money—namely that money is a measure and must be of necessity an institute of law; that the unit of money is all money within a given legal jurisdiction; that the practical essence of money is limitation; and that coins and

notes alike are symbols of money—are fully discussed and illustrated in my ‘Science of Money.’ It is true that at the present time their operation is greatly obscured by the license and abuse of private coinage, but even through this bewildering medium they can still be discussed. It is out of the confusion created by this practice, it is from the fallacy of mistaking metal (which apart from numbers, cannot measure value any more accurately than barter can) for money (which, apart from metal, can, and does, accurately measure value) that all contentions on the subject have arisen ; nay, more, this confusion is to-day imperilling the peace of the world. The wheels of industry are at this moment clogged, and what clogs them chiefly is that gross, that sensuous, that materialistic conception which mistakes a piece of metal for the measure of an ideal relation, a measure that resides not at all in the metal, but in the numerical relation of the piece to the set of pieces to which it is legally related, whether of metal or paper, or both combined. In short, it is this misconception which is responsible for the demonetisation of silver in the Western world, and the consequences traceable to that event.”

In twenty chapters the author discusses the history of Indian, Persian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman moneys, the Sacred Character of Gold, the Gothic, Moslem, Early English, Anglo-Norman and Plantagenet moneys, the Evolution of the Coinage Prerogative, the moneys of Saxony, Scandinavia, Germany, and Argentine, Private Coinage. Three appendices follow on the Statistics of the Ratio, Bank Suspensions Since the Era of Private Coinage, the Gold Movement of 1865-73, and Existing Monetary Systems. A lengthy bibliography, prepared from the books of the British Museum Library, greatly enhances the utility of this excellent manual for the study of the origins of so essential an institution of human society as is money.

There is but one defect in this manual,—a defect common enough in a certain class of historical manuals,—the author goes out of his way to insult the mediæval popes as the executioners and destroyers of the Roman Emperor and the Byzantine Basileus. He speaks too flippantly and without proof (p. 276) of the “effrontery and swagger” of popes, of the “impudent claims of the Vatican,” of “curses from the lips of a scheming pontiff.” The popes uniformly objected to the clipping or debasing of coin ; mediæval Rome itself served in the West as a

great mart of exchange and a regulator of values ; Frederick II was, indeed, a modern man in several senses,—but his reforms were not calculated for the free and independent life of Western Europe ; if the English Kings paid Peter's pence, they drew from their relations to Rome a great strength, for the pontifical "protection" in those days was greater than armies or navies to-day, since it reposed on an unwavering belief and a profound respect. The one element of mediæval unity that held a hundred struggling elements on the road of progress, was the papacy, and the science of money and values owes no less to this confidence-begetting unity, and this universal authority, than the science of diplomacy,—both of them nourished and developed in the shadow of the one great stable power that dominated the formative periods of our modern nations.

Catholic Summer and Winter School Library, Summer School Essays, Vols. I.-II., small 8 vo, pp. 265, 300 ; also Prehistoric Americans, by the Marquis de Nadaillac ; pp. 241 ; Chicago : D. H. McBride & Co., 1896.

These three tasty volumes bring us a part of the good work done in the Catholic Summer Schools since their inception. The Marquis de Nadaillac, Mgr. d'Harlez, and Father de Smedt, S. J., were naturally not present at the sessions of the schools. Their learned contributions were sent from across the water to be read at the meetings. In anthropological studies, Oriental languages, history, and scientific historical criticism, these three men are respectively the peers of any modern writers in their departments. Father de Smedt is the senior of the Bollandists ; the Marquis de Nadaillac is well known by his great work on Prehistoric America, issued some years ago, and Mgr. d'Harlez is one of the most accomplished Chinese scholars in Europe. The other essays in these volumes have an unequal value, but all are worth reading for their suggestiveness and earnestness. Some possess a rare grace of style ; others are the results of grave thought and mature study ; none of them are unworthy of a place in this useful series. We hope the publishers will continue the good work, and not cease from furnishing our Catholic homes with such solid literature, at once cheap, elegant, portable, and instructive. The contents of the two volumes of miscellaneous essays are : Vol. I. Buddhism and Christianity, Mgr. d'Harlez ; Christian Science and Faith Cure, Dr. T. P. Hart ; Growth of Reading Circles, Rev. T. McMillan, C. S. P. ; Read-

ing Circle Work, Rev. W. J. Dalton; Church Music, Rev. R. Fuhr, O. S. B.; Catholic Literary Societies, Miss K. E. Conway; Historical Criticism, Rev. P. C. De Smedt, S. J. Vol. II. The Spanish Inquisition, Rev. J. F. Nugent; Savonarola, Condé B. Pallen, Ph. D.; Joan of Arc, J. W. Wilstach; Magna Charta, J. F. Ewing; Missionary Explorers of the Northwest, Judge W. L. Kelly.

History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages. Translated from the German of Johannes Janssen; Vol. I, (two volumes in the English edition); London : Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.; B. Herder, St. Louis.

We cannot better sum up the contents of this great work than in the succinct phrases of the prospectus, which here follow:

"This first volume of Janssen's History (2 vols. in translation) is a valuable, scholarly, and most interesting record of some fifty years immediately preceding the Reformation—a period in which Germany, by virtue of her improvements in the art of printing and the wide-spread book trade which she consequently developed, stands out as the intellectual center and liberty market of Europe. These pages present a vivid and truthful picture of all the various elements—social, religious, intellectual, artistic, economical, and juridical—which were united in the life of Germany at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries.

The immense impetus received by literature and learning in consequence of John Gutenberg's discovery of the printing-press and movable types in the middle of the fifteenth century, the rapid multiplication of schools of every degree all over Germany, the founding of new universities, public libraries, and other educational centers, as well as the keen interest excited in religion by the increase in the number of Bibles printed in the vernacular, are all admirably set forth.

"The labors of such eminent scholars as Rudolph Agricola, Alexander Hegius, Rudolph von Lauzen, Reuchlin, Cesarius, and others in continuing the ecclesiastical and scholastic reforms initiated by Nicholas of Cusa in 1451, are dwelt upon at some length, and special stress is laid on the religious zeal and enthusiasm which animated them all. 'Intellectual progress on a firm basis of Christian belief' is shown to have been the leading characteristic of the age, and the key-note of individual labor. To use the treasures of classic lore, placed in their

hands by the capture of Constantinople in 1453, for the glory of God and of the Christian religion was the great object of all these learned men. An interesting comparison is drawn between this older school of 'Christian Humanists' and the younger Humanists who later on formed the first school of free-thinkers.

"Several interesting chapters are devoted to the description of the then flourishing condition of German architecture, sculpture, painting, and engraving, with a sketch of Albert Dürer's life and work, and an account of the growth of poetry and popular prose literature in Germany.

"There follows a graphic account of the social conditions of the period, including the great trade and labour guilds; the state of agriculture and the peasant classes; the relations of landlord and tenant; feudal regulations and rights; manners, customs, and dress of the different classes of society—nobles, burghers, artisans, peasants, and professional classes; the new mining industry, and the growth of commerce and capital.

The concluding division of the volume contains an account of the position and constitution of the Holy Roman Empire, of the growth of the power of the Princes, and the introduction of the Roman legal code in place of the ancient German national law; describes the famous Diet of Worms in 1495 (the closing scene, according to Hallam, in the history of the German Middle Ages); gives a character-sketch of the Emperor Maximilian I., friend and patron of learning, and an account of his fruitless efforts at many successive Diets to secure the allegiance of the Princes and to prevent the disintegration of the empire, and concludes with the unsuccessful intrigues of France to obtain possession of the Imperial Crown, and the election of Charles of Hapsburg on the death of Maximilian in 1519.

"The whole narrative is compiled with imaginative insight and laborious precision. This volume has gone through sixteen editions in the German, and Herr Janssen is known to be a high authority, and gives chapter and verse for all his statements."

This translation of Janssen's first volume has long been awaited. It has been conscientiously performed, and has entailed upon the translator many sacrifices. The publishers have seen fit to suppress many of the lengthy and erudite notes, and there is wanting an index. Nevertheless, the value of the work is beyond calculation, and every priest and layman ought

to be possessed at once of this most scientific of works on the origins of the Reformation. We understand that the translation of the second volume is in preparation, in fact is about ready. The arduous undertaking ought to meet with a generous support.

Conquest of the Northwest, and Life of Gen. George Rogers Clark, by William Hayden English ; 2 vols., large 8°, over 125 illustrations ; pp., 1188.

This is the history of the incorporation with the United States in 1779 of the territory immediately northwest of the Ohio and now divided among the great and flourishing States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin and a part of Minnesota.

Two men did this imperishable deed, Gen. George Rogers Clark and Father Pierre Gibault, the Canadian pastor of Vincennes. "To the latter," says Judge Law in his History of Vincennes, "next to Clark and Vigo, the United States are more indebted for the accession of the States comprised in what was original Northwestern territory than to any other man." The former was the intrepid and intelligent military chief who realized better than any one else that "northwest of the Ohio river was the open door by which the hostile Indians raided the white settlements, and that these raids were instigated, planned and prosecuted under the direction of the officers of the British military posts in that country. These were Detroit, Vincennes, Kaskaskia and Cahokia. . . . In his deliberations upon the subject there is no reason to believe that he did not think of the possible ultimate acquisition of the whole of that great country as well as the present defense of the white settlements." The expedition had the support and counsel of Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, George Wythe and George Mason, and was thus the outcome of the common deliberations of the best statesmen that the youthful republic could show. In the eventful years that elapsed from January, 1778, to September, 1783, the task was begun and accomplished, and the imperial pathway secured from ocean to ocean, the granaries of the next century established, and the political unity of the republic on lines wider than the Roman Empire made certain. After Yorktown, it is the greatest event of the Revolution, for the Ohio and the Lakes would be British possessions to-day, were it not for the men who dared this mighty deed, whose thrilling details are told so impressively and scientifically by the author, so well known by his share in the legislative and political life of our country.

The work is based on long and accurate studies of all relative documents, and on many papers that have been preserved to the author through family inheritance. Portraits, plans, maps, patents, diagrams, and other monuments of the period are given in great abundance, and the chronological order of the narrative in no way detracts from its romantic and fascinating interest.

These heroes suffered no less than the men of Valley Forge, and their splendid bravery arouses the highest admiration in the soul of every reader. Prestige, numbers, position, nature, were against them, but an indomitable determination burned in the breast of Clark, and warmed the heart of every member of the heroic little band of invaders.

The Catholic American has an exceptional interest in this book, for it contains a full and documentary account of Father Pierre Gibault, co-founder with Clark of this great complexus of States, and with him ever memorable in their annals, as long as there is a spark of gratitude or a flicker of intelligence.

Gratitude! Gibault asked for five acres of ground in his old age on which to build a little house and to prepare for death, but the tardy action of Government and the interference of Archbishop Carroll, (who protested against the alienation of Church property to an individual clergyman,) prevented the accomplishment of his desire, and so he died beyond the Mississippi in Spanish territory (1804), poor and an exile, though he gave an empire to the United States.

"No county, town, or post-office bears his name; no monument has been erected to his memory, and no head-stone even marks his grave, as its location is entirely unknown," (Vol. I., pp. 189, 190). There should arise at Vincennes a group representing the general and the priest, each in the garb of his vocation, with clasped hands and manly mien, solemnly promising the indissolubility of their great compact. On the four sides of the pedestal might be bronze bas-reliefs representing the departure of Clark, the adhesion of Father Gibault, the march on the British post, and the capture of it. No monument would be better deserved, and none would serve the cause of American patriotism with more lasting effect.

Art and Archæology.

Les Catacombes de Rome, par Henri de l'Épinois, Nouvelle Edition revue, augmentée par M. Paul Allard, Paris, 1896. Alfred Vromant et Cie. 8°., pp. 292, with plates.

The late M. Henri de l'Épinois was well known to the world of historians as one of the erudite band of workers which the École des Chartes has prepared for the study of mediæval documents. His writings and collections of documents concerning the famous process of Galileo won universal admiration, and his numerous studies in fifteenth and sixteenth century life marked him as a conscientious, industrious, and successful worker in the politico-ecclesiastical field. Beatrice Cenci, Alexander VI., Cardinal Gaetani, Nicholas V., Stefano Porcari, Giordano Bruno, the Ligue and the Popes alternated in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* with charming studies on the origins of Christianity. The study of the catacombs was for him a fascinating one, and in 1875 he published the little manual which now appears in a new edition. Less bulky than the manuals of Northcote and Kraus, it has a merit of its own,—excellent choice of materials, order and compactness in the disposition, and a unity of purpose and description is throughout the book. The twenty-one chapters treat successively of the history of the catacombs, the art and symbolism of these underground cities of the dead,—especially the Eucharist, the Cross, Baptism and Confirmation; of the beginning of the Christian society, the Resurrection its cornerstone; of the ancient veneration of the saints, the Blessed Virgin, St. Joseph, and of certain archaic symbols of the Church. M. Paul Allard has perfected the new edition and added some studies of his own, notably a good one on the Epitaph of Abercius. We recommend highly this manual of the artistic or monumental evidences of the primitive Christian life.

Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter. Iter Italicum. von Dr. Adalbert Ebner; Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1896; B. Herder, St. Louis; pp. x.-487; 10 marks.

Dr. Ebner has been tempted by recent paleographical successes of the Academy of Vienna and of the Bollandists, to begin a description and classification of the liturgical manuscripts that lie scattered throughout the archives and libraries of Europe. With means furnished him by the University of Munich at the suggestion of its Faculty of Theology, he visited lately many

libraries and archives of Italy, and compiled a (yet unpublished) catalogue of all the liturgical manuscripts they contained. A portion of these treasures is now made known—those manuscripts which contain the Roman Missal in its ancient form of Sacramentary or in its mediæval shape, full or partial, plain or artistic. To these original sources of knowledge Dr. Ebner adds a number of hitherto unpublished texts of the Ordo Missae and the ecclesiastical Calendar. These curious and interesting documents furnish him with the theme for a number of valuable investigations on the development of the Sacramentary into the Missale Plenum, on the position of the Canon in the Roman Sacramentaries, the text-history of the Canon Missae, and the historical development of the Ornamentation of the Missal.

Herein lies the special value of Dr. Ebner's book. Some thirty illustrations from ancient Missals of Rome, Milan, Florentine, Venice, and other Italian cities, nearly all original photographs, bring before us the devotion and taste with which our Catholic ancestors beautified the text of the Mass, and especially of the Canon, from the seventh century manuscripts of the Gelasian Sacramentary, or rather from the Carlovingian Renaissance, through the Middle Ages, until, from the ornamenting of initials, little by little the full-page illustration of the Canon came to be a *sine qua non* of every Missal. The paleography of these Missal manuscripts is carefully studied out by our author,—no small task, and yet one that furnishes scientific internal criteria of age, origin, etc.

The Enthroned Father (*Majestas Domini*) and the Crucifixion are the usual miniatures of the Preface or the Canon, but the feasts of our Lord and the Saints, liturgical actions, historical facts, and arbitrary motives furnish subjects for the skill of the miniaturist. Germany and France seem to have cultivated this lovely art more than Italy. Certainly, it is in these lands that the most splendid mediæval Missals are found. The perusal of this valuable study reminded us of how little there is substantially new in the art of book-making, and of how much ancient technical tradition of classic times has come down through the conservative care of the Church.

There are many minor details of history scattered through the old Missals,—necrologies, confraternities, the earliest use of Arabic numerals in Europe, the peculiarities of the Missals of the monks and the mendicant orders, the continental devo-

tion to SS. Patrick, Bridget, Columbanus and Gallus, recalling the tireless old Irish scribes, to whom, not only the liturgical, but the scriptural texts owe so much, natural events, like eclipses, the history of Italian families, etc. Dr. Ebner has undertaken a great work, full of promise for the evolution of mediæval art, since the men who wrote the Missals were none other than those who built the Cathedrals and decorated them, a marvelous brotherhood of unselfish and high-minded men, pursuers of the ideal, struggling forever with the nature without and within them, and forever bringing forth new fruits of piety or of art. We hope that ere long an Iter Germanicum, Iter Gallicum, Iter Anglicum, and Iter Hispanicum will be added to this volume, thus furnishing, as did the Mabillons and Blumes in the past, original material in full and accurate condition to the thousands who can follow such studies only from afar.

Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions, by James C. Egbert, jr., Ph.D.
Adjunct Professor of Latin, Columbia College; New York; American
Book Co.; 1896; pp. 468. 8°.

We have now a much needed introduction to the study of Latin Inscriptions. Since the appearance of the fifteen great folios of the *Corpus Latinarum Inscriptionum* some manual was needed by which the 150,000 and more lapidary evidences of Greek and Roman life, thought, and manners might be studied with order and effect. M. René Cagnat's *Épigraphie Latine* (Paris, 2d. ed., 1890) was a very great step in this direction. Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Vol. I., 1892) also provided a general training for this work. But Professor Egbert's book is the first general manual of this kind in English. The Roman wrote his history grandly, not alone in the living pages of Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius, but also on imperishable bronze and marble. His was a kingly people, and his soul was possessed by the same passion of posthumous glory that filled the breasts of Egyptian dynasts and Persian despots. The importance of the subject and the rarity of its treatment among us will perhaps excuse the reproduction of the following page from the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* (January, 1895):

"The passion of inscriptions has been always strong among powerful and cultured peoples, as the modern discoveries in Assyria, Egypt, Persia, and India abundantly testify. Inscriptions were the heralds of Hellenism in its day of pride, as they are to-day the witnesses of the range of its influence. But never were they more numerous than in the palmy days of imperial

Rome, when they stared at the citizen from the arches and the statues of the *fora*, and looked down on him from a hundred basilicas and temples in every city of the mighty East-West world. The walls, the roads, the aqueducts; the boundaries of domains, public and private; the seats in the theatres, the weights and measures, the weapons and curios; the rough marble in blocks and the tiles on the roofs—every material object of public or private life, afforded a space, great or small, to the insatiable ‘man of letters.’ Public acts, like treaties, alliances, plebiscita, law edicts, senatus consulta, and imperial constitutions, were eternalized in bronze while private transactions were preserved with no less care on durable material, as the banker’s accounts, the rent rolls, the tavern bills and political manifestos of Pompeii show us. Sometimes whole annals or biographies were written out on stone, as we see by the Parian *Marmorchronik* and the famous *Monumentum Ancyranum*. Only one familiar with the texts and details of early imperial history can imagine what a multitudinous mass of inscriptions must have existed intact before the downfall of the ancient culture. But they perished miserably at the hands of those two great enemies of human achievements, cruel men and relentless time. One ground them into the earth, and the other swept away all reminiscences of their ancient estate, so that the same silent desolation spread over those relics of Roman greatness which Rome herself had so often brought upon the greatness of older civilization than her own.”

Dr. Egbert's work is divided into two parts: The first contains, besides a bibliography and a description of the Berlin Corpus of Latin Inscriptions, three chapters on the Latin Alphabet (historical and morphological) and on Numerals. The second treats in six chapters the Roman Name, the Names and Titles of the Emperors, Official Titles, Tituli or inscriptions of a public commemorative character, Documents, Restoration and Dating of Inscriptions and Abbreviations. There are supplementary tables of abbreviations and of the inscriptions used in the manual. A carefully made and logical index makes the book of immediate utility to every teacher and student. The work is henceforth indispensable to every profound student of the Latin language, and we would rejoice to see it adopted at least by some chosen few in the highest classes of our colleges. One reason is, that the best modern scientific progress in Latin has been largely along the road of Latin Epigraphy.

Law.

The Principles of the American Law of Bailments, by John D. Lawson, LL.D., Professor of Common Law in the University of the State of Missouri, pp. xvi, 667. St. Louis: F. H. Thomas Law Book Co., 1895.

The Law of Bailments, which has become an important division of our jurisprudence within the past two centuries, and has received able and authoritative treatment at the hands of Sir William Jones, Judge Story, Edwards, Schouler, and other well-known legal writers, finds in this new work of Professor Lawson a very complete and intelligible, as well as a somewhat original expression. Abandoning the customary and complicated though logical analysis of the subject into Depositum, Mandatum, Commodatum, Pignus and Locatio, he divides all bailments into two great classes, viz: 1. The ordinary bailments governed by the general provisions of the law; 2. The exceptional bailments, in reference to each of which the law, for reasons of public policy, has prescribed certain special rules. The first class is subdivided into bailments for the bailor's benefit; bailments for the bailee's benefit; bailments for the benefit of both bailor and bailee. The second class includes innkeepers, common carriers, and telegraphs and telephones. This arrangement enables the author to discuss the whole subject on the basis of the ordinary grounds and measure of legal liability,—a method which renders it much clearer and more easy of comprehension than where the rules governing the various practical forms of bailment are separately considered without referring to the general principles from which they have been developed. This mode of presenting the law of bailments must prove of singular advantage to the student, who will also find in the lucid and forcible style in which these principles and rules are stated a great assistance both to his understanding and his memory. The judgment with which the illustrative cases incorporated into the text have been selected, as well as to their number as to their utility, entitles this volume to additional commendation, and warrants the expectation that the pleasure which the lawyer already familiar with the subject finds in its perusal will be repeated in the experience of the teacher and the student who may use this work for the purpose of instruction.

Hand-Book of the Law of Torts. By Edwin A. Jaggard, A. M., LL.B., Professor of the Law of Torts in the Law School of the University of Minnesota, 2 vols., pp. xvi, 1807. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1895.

The importance and scope of the Law of Torts is indicated by the fact that unlike the other manuals of the Hornbook Series, thus far issued, the present one fills two compact and substantial volumes. The subject is treated by Professor Jaggard on the scientific lines pointed out and so ably maintained in the treatise of Sir Frederick Pollock, which was noticed in the April number of the BULLETIN. This tendency to refer the rules of law to their fundamental principles, and to develop "the legal mind," rather than to cram the legal memory, should receive the heartiest encouragement from the profession as well as from instructors in the law. In the words of the preface to these volumes: "The enormous quantity of matter daily ground out by the mills of the law is making it necessary that the practitioner, as well as the student, should again resort to the first principles. The multitude of current authorities increases the necessity of a corrected analysis and demands a better classification of the law. There is little hope of progression in this direction from its discussion under the heads of concrete objects. * * *" Adopting the method of discussion demanded by this view of the law, the author devotes his first four hundred pages to a consideration of the general principles and doctrines common to all torts, the remainder of his work being occupied with the specific wrongs to which these principles and doctrines are applied. Owing in part to the abtruse nature of the subject and in part to the author's use of modern artificial terminology and his selection of illustrations from cases beyond the comprehension of those just entering upon legal studies, the first portion of his treatise is scarcely fitted for the use of students who are not already familiar with the works of Austin, Holland, etc., and whose reading has not been widely extended in other branches of the law. In the second portion, where concrete and definable offenses are considered, this difficulty is diminished, though even here it is not wholly absent. The subject of torts is generally regarded as among the simpler legal subjects, and as such often appears in the earlier studies of a law school curriculum. A text book for use at that stage of professional education should be adapted to the limited information and undeveloped legal reason of the student, and hence a work like the present is much more suitable for an advanced class in the

subject than for beginners. With this exception (which applies to Professor Jaggard's book only in its Hornbook capacity) these volumes realize the ambition of their author to produce a philosophical treatise worthy to take a place among those which have already adorned the English law.

A Treatise Upon the Law of Pleading Under the Codes of Civil Procedure,
by Philemon Bliss, LL. D., Professor of Law in the Missouri State University and late judge of the Supreme Court of Missouri. Third edition. Revised and annotated by E. F. Johnson, B. S., LL. M., Instructor of Law in the University of Michigan. 1 vol., pp. xxxv, 809. St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1894.

When this treatise by Judge Bliss first appeared in 1878, Code Pleading was yet an experiment, even in States where it had been longest adopted. The business sense, both of the profession and the public, had indeed revolted against the cumbersome formalities and verbose obscurities with which the progress of litigation was impeded, but whether the substitute which had been devised would stand the test of experience was still to be determined. That the experiment has proved successful is probably due in no small measure to the influence which this work of Judge Bliss has exercised upon the minds of the judges and the members of the bar. The clearness with which he distinguished between the unalterable substance of the law of pleadings and those forms of statement which may be indefinitely varied to suit the exigencies of the age, his explanations of the new rules and of their scope and application, his suggestions as to further improvements in the modes of presenting issues, all aided to conciliate opposition, to afford the legal mind an easy transition from the old method to the new, and ensure such perseverance in the trial of the code system as would afford its merits an opportunity to manifest themselves. And now that the period of experiment has passed and the system has become permanently incorporated into the law of many of our States, the lawyer finds in the same treatise a guide to its practical employment, and the answer to numerous questions which it still presents. Of a work which for nearly twenty years has occupied such a place in the profession no extended notice can now be required. The present editor has simplified the use of the text by inserting black-letter headings to the paragraphs, and has added many cases to the notes, distinguishing the leading cases by printing them in larger type. For this service he is entitled to the thanks of all who have access to this edition,

especially students, to whom such slight indications of the matters worthy of particular attention are oftentimes of great assistance.

Handbook on the Construction and Interpretation of the Laws, with a chapter on the Interpretation of Judicial Decisions and the Doctrine of Precedents, by Henry Campbell Black, M. A., author of Black's Law Dictionary and of Treatises on Judgments, Tax Titles, Constitutional Law, etc., 1 vol., pp. x., 409 ; St. Paul : West Publishing Co., 1896.

The duty of instructing students in the principles governing the construction and interpretation of written laws has never been ignored by their professors, although the difficulty of teaching the subject in detail on account of the want of text-books adapted to their use has prevented it from finding a place in the regular curriculum of legal studies. In our judgment, this difficulty is greatly diminished, if not entirely removed, by this new work from the pen of Mr. Black, already the author of treatises which have received wide commendation. The reduction of the rules to separate and simple propositions, followed by, but not interwoven with and buried under, their explanations and illustrations; their arrangement under headings which express true distinctions in the subject-matter to which they apply; and the general clearness and precision with which they are expressed, make it possible to place the book in the hands of a student at an early stage of his legal education with a reasonable hope that he will be able to comprehend its doctrines and apply them during his future studies. Not the least interesting and valuable chapter in this volume is the last, which treats of the Interpretation of Judicial Decisions and the Doctrine of Precedents. In the present tendency to elevate the study of case-law above that of well digested treatises, based upon the examination and comparison of all the cases in the light of permanent legal principles, nothing is more important than that a student should be made to realize that a proposition is not necessarily good law, because he can find a judicial decision in which it is enunciated. It is essential for him to learn to distinguish between the kernel of law which a decision may contain (if it really contains any) and the husks which enclose it and the rubbish under which it is concealed, and to discern the *ratio decidendi*, which gives to the case its sole value as an authority. That this subject is logically related to that of the interpretation of written law is evident, and we deem it fortun-

ate that Mr. Black has brought both together into one volume, where they can so easily be made branches of a continuous course of study.

Natural Science.

On the Densities of Oxygen and Hydrogen, and on the Ratio of their Atomic Weights. By Edward W. Morley, Ph. D.; Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. Washington, 1896.

Aside from the interest that would attach to the ratio of the atomic weights of any of the known elements, this particular case possesses peculiarly important features. Hydrogen, the lightest known gas and the element of smallest atomic weight, is a natural standard for comparison. But the number of other elements with which it unites directly is comparatively small, so that direct comparison is limited. Oxygen, on the other hand, unites with the majority of the elements and, therefore, is peculiarly adapted to this kind of investigation, and the consequent importance of an accurate knowledge of the relative properties of these two elements is sufficiently obvious. The problem has naturally attracted a great deal of attention and brought forth much good and beautiful work, none of which nevertheless was entirely beyond objection. It has, however, been fairly solved at last, and by an American investigator, Professor Morley. In general terms the investigation was conducted by two methods. One presents the unique feature from a theoretical point of view in that the synthesis of water is followed completely, the masses of both constituents, as well as of the final product, being accurately determined. In the second method the comparison of the densities of oxygen and hydrogen, larger masses and pure gases were used than has been the case with previous investigations. In both cases the ingenuity displayed in overcoming the experimental difficulties, and the care and precision of the work is marvelous, and comparable to that of Stas. For these reasons the investigation is a model one, and from the accuracy of the results obtained will, undoubtedly, take its place as a classic. It is refreshing to find in Professor Morley's preface to the monograph, acknowledgment of substantial aid rendered by business corporations, as well as by private generosity and educational institutions, to this extended investigation, from which no immediate "practical" benefit is to be expected.

Jean-Servais Stas. *Ouvres Complètes*. Bruxelles, 1894.

On the 13th December, 1891, died Jean-Servais Stas, one of the foremost figures in the science to which his life had been given. This veteran, rich in years and honors, was a foremost figure in chemistry, and, indeed, in the whole range of experimental science, and the story of his life is a shining text for the scientific worker in this too material age. He is best known to the world from the classic researches on combining weights, researches of fundamental importance for chemistry practically as well as philosophically, and surpassing in their precision and workmanship anything else in the range of experimental science. Suggested by the attractive hypothesis of Prout and Meincke—*i. e.*, "the atomic weight of all the elements are simple multiples of that of hydrogen," Stas' work was the most efficient instrument for its overthrow, and incidentally to the establishment of the law of the constancy of combination by weight, the possible error in his experimental proof being not more than one part in ten million, a degree of accuracy not yet approached in the demonstration of any other natural laws.

The Belgian Academy has just finished a memorial to this greatest of its members, more beautiful and appropriate to the man than any other that human ingenuity has yet devised. Under the editorship of Professor Spring, the collected works of Stas are brought together in three quarto volumes, not the least interesting of which is the last, specifically entitled, "*Oeuvres Posthumes*." To the lover of exact science, in whatever field, this magnificent work can not fail of interest and the pleasure in its possession will undoubtedly be augmented by the evident skill and care in its preparation.

Pittonia, A Series of Botanical Papers by Edward L. Greene, Professor of Botany in the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Vol. III., Parts 13, 14. May-June, 1896.

We welcome to our list of university publications this periodical, formerly published at the University of California. The merits of Professor Greene are so well known that no words of ours are needed to bring them before the public. The appearance of these original and valuable contributions to the science of botany will be always eagerly watched for by every lover of that ancient and attractive study. We append the titles of the papers that make up the numbers just issued: Vol. III., Part 13

(May, 1896): Nomenclature of the Fullers' Teasel; Proposed New Genus of Cruciferæ; New or Noteworthy Species, XV; New Genus of Polemoniaceæ; Some Mexican Eupatoriaceæ. Part 14 (June, 1896): Critical Notes on Certain Violets; Studies in the Compositæ III.; Economic Botany of S. E. Alaska, by W. J. Gorman; New or Noteworthy Species, XVI.

Miscellaneous.

Emmanuel. Official Monthly of the Priest's Eucharistic League and the Apostolic Union. Published monthly by the General Director for the United States of America. Manager, Rev. F. Bede Maler, O. S. B., St. Meinrad, Ind.; Editor's address: 1140 Madison avenue, Covington, Ky.

This modest brochure has reached the middle of its second year, and a glance at its contents shows the benefits it is calculated to confer on its readers, and reminds us of the possibilities that lie in an Eucharistic monthly when they are all drawn out. The Blessed Sacrament is the great central fire from which are fed all the mighty pulses of devotions, zeal, pastoral solicitude, refined and faultless culture, artistic progress, social betterment, political peace and concord, and above all individual self-sacrifice. Hence we welcome this first beginning of an Eucharistic monthly, and trust it will expand the circle of its interests and thereby bring light and consolation to an ever-increasing circle of readers.

A Dictionary of the English and German Languages. Fluegel-Schmidt-Tanger; 2 vols. fol. Laemcke and Buechner, New York, 1896; pp. 968-1006.

This is, by all means, the most practical of the various German-English dictionaries and the one best adapted for general use. Scientific and technical terms are abundantly represented, yet only such as are likely to be needed by the educated classes are introduced. Local idioms and slang foreign to the genius of English, as well as the Scotch, and Irish dialect or peculiarities are neglected. Not so, however, a certain class of Americanisms that are fairly on the way to literary citizenship. Idiomatic phrases and familiar expressions, terms indicative of the manners, institutions, and habits of the two peoples are especially favored. Altogether, for good order and compactness of material, clearness of definition and fulness of meanings, this dictionary de-

serves very high praise, and will at once be an indispensable work of reference wherever the German language is seriously taught in this country.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Child of God. Prayers for little children, with many illustrations, 64mo. Benziger Bros., New York.

The Bread of Angels. Instructions and prayers for Catholics generally, and especially for first communicants. Rev. Bonaventure Hammer, O. S. F. 32mo. Benziger Bros., New York.

Month of May at Mary's Altar. Considerations for every day of the month. From the French by Rev. Thomas F. Ward, 8vo. Benziger Bros., New York.

Eucharistic Conferences. The Papers presented at the First American Eucharistic Congress, Washington, D. C., October, 1895. New York: Catholic Book Exchange, 120 West 60th street, 1896.

A Complete Manual of Canon Law (Anglican), by Oswald J. Reichel, M. A., Vol I. The Sacraments. John Hodges, London, 1896, pp. 416.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

I. General Intelligence.

McMahon Hall Library and Reading Room.—One of the principal rooms in McMahon Hall has been devoted to and fitted up for the purpose of a reference library and literary reading room. A donation of one thousand volumes forms the nucleus of the library, and ample provision has been made for its future extension. The leading American and foreign periodicals are found upon the tables of the reading room, and the philosophical and scientific magazines also appear temporarily before their final deposit in the departmental libraries. The inauguration of this general library and reading room, which is open freely to all the students, is a great addition to the working appliances of the University, and has already received grateful recognition from the students.

Year Book for 1896-'97.—The Year Book for 1896-'97 has just been issued. Compared with those of former years it is attractive not only from its size and general appearance, but because it describes educational work not in prospect merely but in actual operation. It comprises lists of instructors and students, a general statement concerning the objects and achievements of the University at large, and particular statements of the courses given and degrees offered in the different schools, with their several departments. The Faculty consists of thirty-one instructors, some of whom are among the most eminent teachers of their peculiar sciences. The entire body of students numbers one hundred and ten, of whom fifty-five are connected with the School of Divinity, twenty-two with the School of Philosophy, twenty-five with the School of the Social Sciences, and eight with the Institute of Technology. The courses of study offered in the various departments belong strictly to what is known as graduate work; that is, to work not generally undertaken by the student until he has attained the Bachelor's Degree in Arts, Science, or Philosophy. Of these courses there are more than two hundred, arranged in seventeen groups, from which selec-

tions can be made by the student with the concurrence of his professors. Supplementary to the lectures and recitations in these courses are seminaries, academies, journal and debating clubs, literary societies, laboratories and field practice, and other exercises for the review, discussion, and application of the matters taught by the professors in the class-rooms. The Year Book closes with the names of those to whom degrees have been granted in the years 1895 and 1896. Among these are sixteen Bachelors of Divinity, nineteen Licentiates in Divinity, two Doctors of Divinity, three Bachelors of Laws, five Masters of Laws, one Doctor of Letters, and one Doctor of Philosophy. Taking all things into consideration, the condition of the University, as thus exhibited, must be most gratifying to all its friends. With many obstacles, besides its infancy, against which it still has to contend it has nevertheless developed into vigorous life. It has maintained the high standard which was set for it from the beginning, and now affords to ambitious students an opportunity for higher learning and wider culture than has hitherto been obtainable at least in any Catholic institution in the United States.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright on "Criminal Statistics."—The article on "Criminal Statistics" in the April BULLETIN, by Hon. Carroll D. Wright, has attracted wide attention both from the literary press and among students of sociology. In spite of the old adage that, "figures cannot lie," every one knows how easily figures may be manipulated by ignorant or fraudulent sciolists to support either side of almost any proposition. A considerable portion of the lectures delivered at the University by Mr. Wright during the current year has been devoted to the exposure of statistical fallacies, and an explication of the methods by which they may be avoided. In this article he has applied the same methods to the statistics of crime, and shown how baseless are the conclusions which are often drawn from them by careless or ill-informed writers on the subject. And the article has proved itself especially acceptable to the critical press at this time, when the assertion is so freely made by persons not unknown to fame that crime and pauperism are steadily increasing and that the masses of the people are gradually deteriorating in economic security as well as morals.

The New Dormitory.—Ground has been broken for the new dormitory for lay students and the building is expected to be

ready for occupation at the opening of the Fall term. It will be of brick, four stories in height above the basement, and afford accommodations for between forty and fifty students. The rooms are in suites consisting of study and bedroom, well lighted and ventilated, and so arranged that all will receive sunlight in the winter season. In the basement the recreation rooms, refectory, and storage rooms are located. On the main floor are a parlor, and a chapel for the use of resident clerical professors. In every respect the building will be equal in convenience and comfort to the best college dormitories in the country.

Public Lectures.—Dr. Faust's Lectures.—The closing lecture in the Winter and Spring Course was delivered, in the unavoidable absence of Rev. Father Mullany, by A. J. Faust, Ph.D., on the 26th of May, his subject being a "Comparison of the Characters and Influence of George Eliot and Mother Frances Raphael," two of the most noted women of our time. Born one in 1820, the other in 1823, for nearly sixty years these women were contemporaries, each exercising in her sphere a potent influence upon the thoughts and lives of her associates. With the exception of Mrs. Browning, George Eliot was the most cultured woman of her age. Her marked individuality, her vigorous thought, her independence of others, her indifference to hostile criticism made her solitary among the literary women of England. In early life her religious feelings and convictions were deep and strong, but as her mind developed under the influence of German free thought, and her life gradually identified itself with the agnostic element in England through her connection with the *Westminster Review*, she became also an agnostic. After she entered into an alliance with Mr. Lewes, and under his inspiration directed her attention to novel writing. Although tabooed by society, she attained a wide and merited reputation, but her inner life was sad. "Lewes said that life was a bad business, but we must make the best of it, and to this George Eliot said, 'Amen'."

Mother Frances Raphael, known to the world as Augusta Theodosia Drane, was the realization of Emerson's famous saying, "Civilization is the influence of good women." Her first twenty-eight years she spent in the Anglican Church, devoting herself after her arrival at womanhood to works of charity. Under the influence of the Oxford movement she was attracted to the Catholic Church, and through many struggles at last found her

way to the truth and became a Catholic in 1851. In obedience to a long-felt vocation she entered the Convent of the Third Order of St. Dominic at Clifton, and eventually became Prioress and Provincial of her Order. The last forty-three years of her life were spent in religious labors and literary work, exhibiting her remarkable ability to write, to build, and to rule. Her published volumes, over thirty in number, embrace histories, biographies, poems, fiction, and doctrinal treatises, all of the highest order of merit and filled with sentiments of beauty, hopefulness and love.

The parallel or contrast between these talented, laborious, and famous women is full of valuable suggestions. One can but ask himself what would have been the character, history, and influence of George Eliot if in her early womanhood she, too, had found strength and repose in the bosom of the Church.

Early Christian Art.—A special spring course of illustrated public lectures was given in the McMahon Hall during April and May, by Rev. Dr. Shahan, Professor of Early Church History, on the "Origins and Monuments of Early Christian Art." The subjects were as follows: April 23d, Primitive Christianity and the Fine Arts; April 30th, Early Christian Architecture; May 7th, Early Christian Painting; May 14th, Early Christian Sculpture; May 21st, Early Christian Mosaics; May 28th, Primitive Christian Inscriptions.

Donations to the Library.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—Proceedings of the U. S. National Museum, Vol. XVII. Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for 1892-'93.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Report of the Secretary of Agriculture, 1895. Circulars No. 4, 18. Division of Agricultural Soils, Bulletin No. 3. Section of Foreign Markets, Bulletin Nos. 6, 7, 11, and 13. Division of Forestry, Bulletin Nos. 10 and 12. Division of Entomology, Bulletin Nos. 2 and 3 (new series). Division of Entomology, technical series No. 2 and Circular No. 15, second series. Report of the Statistician for 1895. Report of the Pomologist for 1894. Report of the Chief of the Division of Publications for 1895. Tenth and Eleventh Annual Reports of the Bureau of Animal Industry. Division of Statistics (new series), Report Nos. 133 and 134. Bureau of Animal Industry, Circular No. 5

and Bulletin Nos. 10 and 11. Office of Experiment Stations, Bulletin Nos. 27, 28, and 29. Division of Chemistry, Bulletin No. 48. Division of Botany, Contributions, Vol. III., No. 7. Division of Publications, Index to the Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture for 1837 to 1893, inclusive. Farmer's Bulletin, Nos. 35 and 36. Division of Agrostology, Circular No. 3. Division of Ornithology and Mammalogy, Bulletin No. 8. N. H. Eglesson: Arbor Day, Its History and Observance. Edw. Atkinson, Ph. D.: The Science of Nutrition and the Art of Cooking.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.—Report of the Commissioner of Navigation for 1895. Annual Report of the Comptroller of Currency for 1895, Vol. I.

U. S. BUREAU OF EDUCATION.—Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1892-'93. Edw. Atkinson, Ph. D.: The Science of Nutrition and Art of Cooking.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—CENSUS OFFICE.—Eleventh Census, 1890: Report upon Wealth, Debt and Taxation; Report on the Statistics of Agriculture. Eleventh Census, 1890: Report on Vital and Social Statistics in the U. S., Part III; Statistics of Death. Eleventh Census, 1890: Report on Transportation, Part I; Transportation by Land. Eleventh Census, 1890: Report on Manufacturing Industries in the U. S., Part I, Totals for States and Territories.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—CENSUS DIVISION.—Abstract of the Eleventh Census, 1 vol. 8°.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF CANADA.—Annual Report, Vol. VI, 1892-'93, 1 vol. 8°.

MINISTÈRE DE L'INSTRUCTION PUBLIQUE DE FRANCE.—Journal des Savants, Mai, Juin, Juillet, Aout, Sept., Oct. H. de la Ferrière: Lettres de Catherine de Medicis, T. V.; Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Etudes, T. V.; Bulletin de Géographie histor. descriptive, 1895, Nos. 1 and 2; Exposition Intern. de Chicago, Rapport de la délégation ouvrière; Bulletin du Comité des Travaux hist. and scient. Congrès des Sociétés Savantes; Bulletin historique et Philologique, année 1894, Nos. 3, 4; Revue des Travaux Scientifiques, t. XIV. n. 11, 12; t. XV. n. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

AMBASSADE DE FRANCE À WASHINGTON.—Exposition intern. de Chicago: Rapport du Commissaire Général de l'Agriculture, Rapport sur le matériel des chemins de fer, Rapport administratif.

RT. REV. THOMAS O'GORMAN, Bishop of Sioux Falls.—Bibliothèque del Ecole des Chartes, 53 vols. in 8°. Hermann von der Hardt, *Magnum oecumenicum Constantiense Concilium*, 6 (in 3) in fol.; Helmstadt, 1700. Et. Baluze, *Vitæ Paparum Avieninionensium*, 2 in 4°. J. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina*, 3 in 8°, Florence, 1858. H. Finke, *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*, in 8°. G. Saige, *Les Juifs du Languedoc*, anterieurement au XIV. siècle, 3; 1 in 8°. G. B. Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen-Age*, 1 in 8°. Arthur Beugnot, *Les Juifs d'Occident*, 1 in 8°, 65 vols.

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL SATOLLI.—Rev. James J. McGovern, D. D.: *Life and writings of the Right Rev. John McMullen, 1st Bp. of Davenport*; Rev. F. Arnaudt, S. J.: *The Imitation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus*.

RIGHT REV. IGN. HORSTMANN, Bishop of Cleveland.—*Description de l'Egypte*, Paris, 1821-1829, 2d ed., 24 vols. in 4° and 11 large folios of plates. This is a second edition of the celebrated work prepared by the savants who accompanied Napoleon in his expedition into Egypt. The title of the first edition was: *Description de l'Egypte et Recueil des Observations et des Recherches qui ont été faites en Egypte pendant l'expédition de l'armée française*; Publ. sous la direction de Mr. Jannard, par les ordres de S. M. l'Empeur. Paris: Imp. impér., 1809.

THE DUKE DE LOUBAT.—Dr. Eduard Seler: *Wandmalereien von Mitla*, 1 vol. in 4°, Berlin, 1895; Gabriel Marcel: *Reproductions de cartes et globes relatifs à la découverte de l'Amérique*, 1 in 4° terte; *Atlas* 1° in fol. Paris, 1894.

THE LATE JOSEPH WILCOX, Esq., Phila.—*Geological Survey of Pennsylvania: A Summary Description*, Vol. 3, p. 1 and 2, 2 vols., 8°, Index; *Final Summary Report*, 1 vol., 6 maps.

THE MARQUIS DE CHAMBRUN—14 Brochures, 69 numbers of "*Revue des Deux Mondes*" et "*Correspondant*."

J. V. HEALY, Brooklyn.—*Mémoires d'un Voyageur qui se repose*; London, 1806, 3 in 8°. Andrew Marvell; His Works; London, 1772; 2 in 18°. De Sardéry, translated by H. Cogan: *Ibrahim or the Illustrious Bassa*; London, 1674, 1 in fol. The Philanthropic results of the War in America; 1 in 24°. V. Ball: *The Diamonds, Coal, and Gold of India*; London, 1881; 1 in 24°. Francis Mark-

ham: *The Book of Honour*; London, 1625; in 4°. John Selden: *Titles of Honor*; London, 1631; 1 in 4°. Jasper Mayne: *Part of Lucian made English from the Original (sic)*, Oxford, 1663; 1 in 4°.

HON. JUSTICE GARLAND.—*Fur Seal Arbitration; Proceedings of the Arbitration (Washington) Tribunal*; 8 vols. in 8°.

HON. JUSTICE PAGNUELS (Montreal).—*Monument Maisonneuve* 1 in 4°.

REV. F. A. TANQUEREY, S.S.—*De Vera Religione, de Ecclesia Christi, de Fontibus Theologicis*; 1 vol. in 8°. Compliments of the author.

Archbishop Kain's Gift to the Gaelic Library.—Archbishop Kain, of St. Louis, has given to the Gaelic Library five splendid folios containing a large share of the ancient Irish texts preserved at Dublin. Their titles are as follows:

LEABHAR NA FEINNE, Vol. I. Gaelic texts. Heroic Gaelic ballads collected in Scotland chiefly from 1512 to 1871. Collected from old manuscripts preserved at Edinburg and elsewhere, etc. Arranged by J. F. Campbell, London, 1872 (in folio).

LEABHAR NA H-UIDHRI: A collection of pieces in prose and verse, in the Irish language, compiled and transcribed about A. D. 1100 by Moelmuiiri Mac Ceileachair. Dublin, 1870 (in folio).

LEABHAR BREAC, the Speckled Book, otherwise styled Leabhar Mór Dúna Doighre, the Great Book of Dun Doighre. A collection of pieces in Irish and Latin compiled from ancient sources about the close of the fourteenth century. Dublin, 1876 (great in folio).

THE BOOK OF LEINSTER, sometimes called the Book of Glen dalough. A collection of pieces (prose and verse) in the Irish language, compiled, in part, about the middle of the twelfth century, with introduction, analysis of contents, and index, by Robert Atkinson, M. A., LL. D. Dublin, 1880 (great in folio).

THE BOOK OF BALLYMOTE: A collection of pieces (prose and verse) in the Irish language, compiled about the beginning of the fifteenth century. * * * With introduction, analysis of contents and index by Robert Atkinson, M. A., LL.D. Dublin, 1887 (great in folio).

Of these the first is a printed collection, rare, and of great value, made by the famous Gaelic scholar and folklorist Camp-

bell. The others are fac-simile reproductions of the great Irish miscellaneous manuscripts known to scholars as the Leabhar Na H-Uidhri, the Leabhar Breac, the Book of Leinster, and the Book of Ballymote. These books will always be the cornerstone of this collection, and the gratitude of all future philologists will go out to the Archbishop for his splendid and timely gift. Further particulars concerning these books may be found in O'Curry's "Lectures on the Manuscript Materials for Irish History."

II. School of Theology.

The Departure of Dr. O'Gorman.—The University hereby expresses its sincere regret at the loss of so devoted, gifted, and experienced a member of its teaching corps, and wishes him the heartiest God-speed in his new career. Yet he has not entirely gone from us, but remains on the staff of the theological faculty as *Doctor Emeritus*, as the following correspondence shows:

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 20, 1896.

To the RT. REV. J. J. KEANE, D. D.,
Rector of C. U. A.

RT. REV. DEAR RECTOR:—The Brief of my appointment to the See of Sioux Falls which is at hand ends my career as professor in the University over which you preside. The assurance conveyed to me by the Holy See that God calls me to other fields of labor is the only alleviation to the deep regret I feel in the severing of my connection with a body which in learning is unsurpassed and in dignity is inferior to none but the Episcopate.

The five years I have spent in daily and fraternal contact with the eminent men who are gathered around you and coöperate with you in the difficult, yet wonderfully successful beginnings of your rectorship, have been the most fruitful and the happiest of my life. Amid the hostilities that have assailed the great work to which God and the Holy See have appointed you, your mainstay and your joy have been the devotion to their duties and the affection for your person invariably manifested by the professors whom you govern and guide. Such have been—as far as the weakness of nature allowed—my own efforts and sentiments during my stay in the University, and such, I pray, may

be ever the efforts and sentiments of all professors that are yet to come to the growing work.

I beg you, Rt. Rev. Dear Rector, to transmit notice of my resignation from the Chair of Ecclesiastical History to the Honorable Board of Directors with my profound gratitude for the honor which their appointment conferred on me five years ago. I beg you also to transmit the same notice to the Faculty of Theology and to the Senate which have always been indulgent to my shortcomings and kind to me beyond my deserts. Through you I solicit of the Faculty of Theology a great favor, of which I should not dream if the Constitutiones Facultatis Theologicae (Cap. II., No. III.) did not suggest it. I pray that I be named "Doctor Emeritus." I ask this honor in order that I may keep as close a connection as possible with the most honorable corporation within the Church of the United States.

I remain, Rt. Rev. Dear Rector,

Yours fraternally in Christ,

THOS. O'GORMAN,
Bishop-elect of Sioux Falls.

The Faculty of Theology unanimously accepted the new bishop as its first *Doctor Emeritus*, and directed the Secretary of the Faculty to notify him of its action, and to express in suitable words its regret at his departure and its grateful remembrance of his manifold coöperation in the pioneer work of the University. The following is the text of the Secretary's letter:

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, April 6, 1896.

RT. REV. THOMAS O'GORMAN, D. D.,
Bishop-elect of Sioux Falls.

RT. REV. DEAR SIR: At the last meeting of the Faculty of Theology your letter to the Rt. Rev. Rector, under date of March 20, was read, announcing formally your resignation from our body to accept the See of Sioux Falls. Your kindly wisdom, your sympathy and coöperation in the constant labor of founding and conducting a great school of universal knowledge, your prudence and fortitude through all the years of your teaching, have greatly endeared you to us, while the affectionate tone of your letter, and the high esteem which it betrays for the teaching office, render more keen the loss which your promotion entails.

With unanimity the Faculty have chosen you as their first *Doctor Emeritus*, and are happy thereby to keep you among us, if not in person, at least in sympathy, good-will, and devotion to the noble cause for which you have already accomplished so much.

I am also directed to express the sincere submission of the Faculty of Theology to the will of the Holy See in calling you to the high and arduous duties of the American Episcopate, and to make known to you the sentiments of affection with which your former colleagues accompany you to your new field of labor on the broad and fertile prairies of the Northwest.

I remain, Rt. Rev. Dear Bishop,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

THOMAS J. SHAHAN, Secretary.

Consecration of Dr. O'Gorman.—Dr. Thomas O'Gorman, our professor of Modern Church History, was consecrated Bishop of Sioux Falls, South Dakota, on Sunday, April 19, in St. Patrick's Church, this city, by His Eminence Cardinal Satolli, Apostolic Delegate, assisted by the Rt. Rev. Martin Marty, D. D., Bishop of St. Cloud, and Rt. Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., Rector of the University. The following Archbishops and Bishops were present: Most Rev. John J. Williams, D.D., of Boston; Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D., of St. Paul; Most Rev. John J. Kain, D.D., of St. Louis; Rt. Rev. Bishop O'Hara, D.D., of Scranton, and his coadjutor, Rt. Rev. Michael Hoban, D.D.; Rt. Rev. P. Engel, D.D.; Rt. Rev. Bishop McGoldrick, D.D., of Duluth; Rt. Rev. Camillus P. Maes, D.D., of Covington; Rt. Rev. Henry Cosgrove, D.D., of Davenport; Rt. Rev. John Shanley, D.D., of Jamestown; Rt. Rev. Bishop Cotter, D.D., of Winona; Rt. Rev. Bishop McGovern, D.D., of Harrisburg; Rt. Rev. P. Donohue, D.D., of Wheeling. The discourse was preached by Archbishop Ireland, and will long be remembered for its splendid eloquence. After the consecration a banquet was served to the visiting clergy in the old Carroll Institute Hall. The new Bishop, at its conclusion, expressed his gratitude and pleasure for the presence of so many members of the hierarchy and the reverend clergy. We give below the text of his discourse:

Discourse of Dr. O'Gorman.—“I should be cold-hearted and hard-hearted indeed if I did not feel the brightness and warmth as well as the burdens and warnings of this day; if I did not yield to the honor and friendship testified by this large and illustrious

gathering. I do feel and I do yield with sentiments of deepest gratitude. Yet God forbid that I should be so overweening and self-conceited as to take exclusively unto myself the credit of your presence. I am but the occasional, not the efficient, cause of the brilliancy of this feast. That is owing chiefly to His Eminence, the consecrator, then to the illustrious orator of the day, and then to the noble and beloved institution under whose auspices this ceremony has been retained and celebrated in the Capital City of the country—the Catholic University of America.

Therefore it behooves me at once to express my thanks to His Eminence, the Pro-Delegate Cardinal Satolli, for the great honor he has done me, for this public kindness, crowning many others more private, that shall be treasured in my heart until my dying hour. From the day I greeted him on the deck of the Majestic in New York Bay until the present moment I have had the undeserved honor of being near him, in daily companionship while the University was his home, a privilege shared by my colleagues, and in many a long journey throughout the land. To-day, while thanking him for consecrating me, I beg leave to say publicly that I have learned more and more during my intercourse with him to esteem, revere, and love him. What I chanted awhile ago I now repeat with intensesest sincerity,—*Ad Multos Annos.*

Of the preacher of the day I cannot trust myself to say many words. You, my friends, know, the country knows, that we two are as brothers. Brothers cherish in silence and need not put into words their mutual affection. It is a welcome Providence and a personal joy that as my earlier, so also my later, years are to be passed in close companionship with the great Archbishop of St. Paul.

I count among the honors and pleasures of this day the presence of my Episcopus Originis, the wise, the prudent, the venerable archbishop of the city of my birth, Boston. I return most special thanks for the favor he does me. On the other prelates and clergymen outside the University who are here present, I have no claim beyond their respect for the University and their kindness to myself. With most of the priests before me, men of my own age, men who have reached through many years of priesthood commanding positions and the esteem of the country, I have an acquaintance formed in the past, fortified and endeared by the present and destined, I trust, to last *ad multos annos.* To them all I give most cordial thanks.

The West is peculiarly noticeable here to-day. The Archbishop of St. Louis, the Bishop of Covington, the Bishop of Davenport, all the suffragans of St. Paul, the Rt. Rev. Abbot of St. John's, Minnesota, the Very Rev. Administrator of Sioux Falls, and many priests from beyond the Mississippi bring into this torrid atmosphere of Washington an unusual breeziness. The reason is that from the West I came, and to the West I go back. The West is my home, and, as the old song has it, "Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam, be it ever so humble there is no place like home." Do not mistake me; my home, the province of St. Paul, is not humble by any means—I mean it is not obscure, unknown. On the contrary, for reasons that need no explaining, its fame is world-wide, its faith in its own future is unbounded, its hopes are as limitless as its own prairies, and its ways as resistless as its own blizzards. To a corner of that province I am assigned where a warm welcome from priests and people awaits me. Sioux Falls is a missionary field, such as I lived in during the early part of my priestly existence, and therefore a most suitable place for me. Long enough have I taught sitting in the professor's chair; a voice has come to me, *Euntes docete*, so I take to the road, or rather like the man in the parable, *Exiit seminare*. May the season be propitious; may the rain not fail; may God give increase; may the harvest abound.

Alas, although the prospect stirs hopes, the retrospect causes regret. The pleasures I was thinking of in the old song just quoted are those of the mind, and the palaces those of science; I was thinking of the Catholic University of America. Companionship more learned, cultured, and elevating than that of the professors of the University and of its genial Rector I never shall find. Audiences more worthy of a teacher's ambition, more sympathetic to stir him to the highest intellectual efforts than the picked and keen-witted students of the University I never can have. Communion so frequent and close with the great minds of the past as was my lot in the halls of the University I must hereafter forego. Farewell to the happiest, the most fruitful and honorable period of my mental life; and no other life counts, except, of course, that of grace and good works. Who shall blame me, then, if I regret the intellectual leisure so full of nobility and honor, so void of cares and sorrows? However, one thing I shall not lose: it will ever be my boast and

glory that I was in and with the Universiyy in its early struggles, in the days when its battles for the right to live, for a place in the world of science were fought and won—won thanks to Leo XIII, his Apostolic Delegate, to the University's watchful Chancellor and trustees, energetic Rector, brilliant professors and loyal students. There is not in the land to-day a broad-minded and fair-minded man who doubts that the University was needed; that it fills a vacant place; that instead of antagonizing any part of our system of Catholic education, it helps, raises, and completes the system; that it has secured permanency, intellectually, financially and every other way.

At any rate, so thinks and so has spoken he to whom above all others is committed the duty of teaching the world, who from his exalted position sees farthest and reads best the needs and signs of the times,—the Pontiff on the watch tower; he has spoken not once, but often; he has called this University into life; has nursed it into vigorous youth; has bidden it Godspeed—and against this supreme power what others shall prevail? May the success of the University go on ever increasing, was one of the prayers in my heart while prostrate before the altar this morning, will be one of the wishes of my heart often and lovingly wafted to the Capital City while roaming the prairies of South Dakota. Rend the veil of the future and read on the pages of posterity that the two greatest facts of the American Church in the latter part of the nineteenth century were the foundation of the Catholic University of America and the institution of the Apostolic Delegation! The two facts are contemporaneous, they are the two prominent factors in the ceremony of this day."

Mgr. Schroeder and the German Chair.—Mgr. Schroeder, our professor of Dogmatic Theology, has taken a lively interest in the establishment of a University course of German language and literature. He has assisted at several meetings of German-American Societies at Pittsburg, Jersey City, and Brooklyn, in all of which he spoke feelingly and successfully of the establishment of a Chair of German. We sincerely trust that this very noble purpose will soon have its fulfillment, and that the language and literature of the Fatherland will soon be represented in our teaching corps by one of its ripest scholars. Thus the good work goes on, and we may soon hope to see, with the establishment of a Chair or Chairs for the Romance Languages, a complete school of Modern Philology, at least for the great languages of Europe and America.

The Rev. Lucian Johnston, S. T. L., of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, formerly pastor of Hyattsville, Md., has been appointed a fellow in the Faculty of Theology and instructor in Ecclesiastical History. Father Johnston is a son of Col. Richard Malcolm Johnston, of Baltimore, the well-known novelist and essayist, and is a graduate of the American College at Rome.

III. School of Philosophy.

Additions to the Hellenic Library.—During the year the Hellenic Library has received many valuable additions through the kindness of the friends of the University and the Professor of Hellenic Literature, among which the following deserve especial mention: Thirty-five volumes from Rev. P. H. MacDermott, of St. Patrick's Church, Johnstown, N. Y.; forty-five volumes from John W. McCarren, of 280 Barrow street, Jersey City, N. J., in memory of his father, William McCarren, Esq.; eighty-four volumes by Rev. Edward McSweeny, D. D., of Mt. St. Mary's.

Money Gifts to the Hellenic Library.—The Rev. Edward McSweeny, D. D., of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., has given one hundred and fifty dollars to the departmental library of Hellenic studies, and Mr. John McCarren, of Jersey City, has given, for the same purpose, one hundred and thirty dollars, in memory of his father, Mr. William McCarren.

Additions to the Chemical Library and Museum.—During the past year the following gifts have been made to the Chemical Library: Very Rev. Mgr. McMahon, Ure's Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures and Mines; Dr. Thomas M. Chatard, Washington, D. C., eighteen volumes of the *Berg-und Hüttenmännische Zeitung* and a collection of pamphlets; Prof. W. C. Robinson, Kane's Chemistry; Mrs. W. C. Robinson, Fresenius' Manual of Qualitative Chemical Analysis, Plattner's Manual of Analysis; Dr. David T. Day, U. S. Geological Survey, Mineral Resources of the United States; Rev. James P. F. Kelley, Somerville, Mass., Journal of the Chemical Society of London for 1896; Rev. John J. Coan, Cambridge, Mass., The Chemical News, (London) for 1896; Dr. F. K. Cameron, Journal of the American Chemical Society for 1896; Rev. Dr. J. J. Griffin, Berichte der deutschen Chemischen Gesellschaft for 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896; Zeitschrift für analytische Chemie for 1896; Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie for 1896; Elektrochemische Zeitschrift for 1896;

Monatshefte fur Chemie for 1896; Revue des Travaux Chimiques des Pays-Bas for 1896; Rev. Dennis O'Callaghan, Boston, Mass., Zeitschrift fur inorganische Chemie for 1896; Rev. J. J. Graham, Haverhill, Mass., Bulletin de Chimie et de Physique for 1896; Rev. Philip F. Sexton, Malden, Mass., Annales de Chimie et de Physique for 1896; Rev. Wm. F. Powers, East Cambridge, Mass., Liebig's Annalen der Chemie for 1896; Rev. D. M. Murphy, Haverhill, Mass., Journal fur praktische Chemie for 1896; Rev. Edward T. Clexton, Boston, Mass., Zeitschrift fur physikalische Chemie for 1896.

Gifts to the Chemical Museum.—Mr. M. H. Hagerty, New York, N. Y., 1,000 bottles for museum specimens; Standard Oil Company, through Mr. Daniel Dea, New York, N. Y., a complete collection of the Company's products; Bosshardt and Wilson Manufacturing Company, Philadelphia, Pa., a collection of oils and waxes; The W. J. Gordon Manufacturing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio, samples of glycerine; The Carborundum Company, Monongahela, Pa., specimens of carborundum; The Joseph Dixon Crucible Company, Jersey City, N. J., specimens of graphite.

IV. School of the Social Sciences.

Work of the Year.—The work of the year in the School of Social Sciences closed on June 12. During the year the courses in Sociology, Economics, and Political Science have been steadily pursued by the students in those Departments,—their work consisting to some extent of public lectures and recitations, but principally of personal research. In the Department of Law from twelve to fifteen hours of public instruction have been given per week, besides the supervision of elective studies by the advanced classes. The general character of the work has been excellent, several of the students attaining a stand of 90 on a scale of 100 at the annual examinations.

Degrees in the Law Department.—At the Commencement on June 16, 1896, the degree of Bachelor of Laws was conferred on Mr. William T. Cashman, of Boston, Mass., and Mr. George S. Connell, of New York City. At the same time the degree of Master of Laws was bestowed on Brainard Avery, Esq., of Proctor, Vt.; James E. Bourke, Esq., of Kansas City, Mo.; James L. Kennedy, Esq., of Greensburgh, Pa., and Thomas D. Mott, Jr., Esq., of Los Angeles, Cal.

The courses offered by each of the foregoing students for examination for his degree, and the average mark which he attained were as follows:

Mr. Cashman: Real Property, Corporations, Equity, and Evidence. Mark 90.

Mr. Connell: Real Property, Corporations, Commercial Law, Evidence, and Social Ethics. Mark 88.

Mr. Avery: Real Property, Corporations, Wills, Criminal Law and Evidence. Mark 89.

Mr. Bourke: Corporations, Railroads, International Law, Military Law. Mark 93.

Mr. Kennedy: Corporations, Railroads, Telegraphs, and Telephones, Municipal Corporations, Economics, Social Ethics, and Logic. Mark 90.

Mr. Mott: Corporations, Railroads, Telegraphs, and Telephones, Municipal Corporations, Economics, and Social Ethics. Mark 92.

The examinations were in writing and were not competitive. All the work in connection with the courses thus elected and offered for degrees was personal, not class work, and the examinations were of the same character,—the number of questions propounded to each student varying from sixty-eight to one hundred, according to the nature and scope of his courses.

V. The Institute of Technology.

The Organization of the Institute of Technology.—During the year it became apparent that the courses of instruction offered in Engineering and Applied Mathematics in the Department of Technology required for their proper development a different organization from that of a department in the School of Philosophy. Accordingly the instructors and students in those courses have been constituted a distinct division of the University under the name of the Institute of Technology, and as soon as it may be expedient, will become one of the Schools of the University, with a complete Faculty of its own. Meanwhile the work is conducted by professors of the School of Philosophy, who in the coming year will give courses in Applied Mathematics, Mechanical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and Civil Engineering. The Institute will be supplied with all necessary apparatus, and will afford an opportunity for obtaining a complete education in the above-named branches of the Applied Sciences.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

The following documents speak for themselves, and are great evidence of the interest of the Holy Father in the work and progress of the University.

The College of the Holy Cross.

REVERENDE DOMINE.

Libenter ex litteris tuis Beatissimus Pater comperit iam exequutioni feliciter mandatum esse quod ipse per Epistolam ad Eminentissimum Cardinalem Gibbons admodum commendarat; ut nempe ad Catholicam studiorum universitatem Collegium institueretur quo ex diversis Americae Institutis alumni acrioris ingenii et laetoris spei convenienter recte riteque educandi. Igitur Sanctitas Sua Sacerdotibus Congregationis Sanctae Crucis, sub quorum regimine Collegium viget, paterne gratulatur. Proque eo quo flagrat studio ad rectam iuvenum institutionem tum in re religiosa tum in re scientifica appreccatur ex animo ut Collegium ipsum floreat, alumnorumque numero et merito augeatur. Id ut, dante Deo, aptatis eveniat augustus Pontifex tibi ceterisque e Congregatione S. Crucis qui Collegio operam navant et alumnis universis apostolicam Benedictionem amatissime impertitur. Haec dum laetus ad te refero sinceram animi existimationem testor, meque tibi profiteor. Addictissimum,

M. CARD. RAMPOLLA.

REV. DR. JOHN ZAHM, Procurator-General
of the Congregation of Holy Cross.

REVEREND FATHER: His Holiness was pleased to learn from your communication that, in accordance with the wish which he himself expressed in a letter to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, there has been established at the Catholic University a college in which students of superior talent and promise, from different seats of learning throughout America, may receive the benefits of a proper training.

Wherefore, the Holy Father extends paternal congratulations to the priests of the Congregation of Holy Cross under whose guidance the institution flourishes. Prompted by his zeal for

the advancement of religious and scientific knowledge, he prays from the fulness of his heart that the College itself may continue to thrive and be blessed in the number and the merit of its students. And that this happy issue may, by the Providence of God, be brought about, our august Pontiff most lovingly bestows his Apostolic Benediction not only upon you and the other members of the Congregation of Holy Cross who in any way assist the undertaking, but also upon its present and future students.

It gives me much pleasure to communicate this to you, and to testify at the same time my sincere esteem. I remain,

Yours, devotedly,

M. CARD. RAMPOLLA.

Rome, May 13, 1896.

Rt. Rev. Dr. Thomas O'Gorman's Church History.

ROMA LI 25 APRILE, 1896.

ILLME ET REVME DOMINE.

Accepi donum ab Amplitudine Tua mihi oblatum, nempe tuam historiam Ecclesiae Catholicae in Statibus Foederatis. Valde acceptum hoc munus mihi fuit, ac debitas Ampl. Tuae gratias pro eodem refero. Maxime laudabile consilium est libros edere in favorem Ecclesiae in locis, ubi adhuc plurimi sunt, qui extra illam degunt, sicut est in ista regione et salutares inde electus secururos sperandum est.

Interim Deum precor ut te diu sospitet,

Amplitudinis Tuae,

Addictissimus Servus,

M. CARD. LEDOCHOWSKI, Praef.

MONS. THOMAE O'GORMAN,

Epo Siouxarmen.

ROME, S. CONG. DE PROPAGANDA FIDE, April 15, 1896.

RT. REV. SIR: I have received your History of the Catholic Church in the United States. It is a very acceptable gift, and I offer you my thanks for the same. The publishing of such books in favor of the Church is an extremely praiseworthy thing, especially in places where there are very many outside her pale, as is the case in your country, and happy results are to be hoped therefrom.

Very devotedly yours,

M. CARD. LEDOCHOWSKI, Prefect.

MGR. THOMAS O'GORMAN, Bishop of Sioux Falls.

ILLMO E REVMO SIGNORE.

Mi Sono giunti col foglio di V. G. Illma e Revma del 5 corrente i due esemplari del suo Manuale della Storia della Chiesa negli Stati Uniti. Mi sono affrettato a presentare al S. Padre unitamente alla relativa di Lei lettera quello a Lui destinato, e godo di significarle che Sua Santita ha espresso il suo gradimento per tale offerta, trattandosi di lavoro fatto da chi è stato oggetto della sua particolare benevolenza e fiducia col promuoverlo all' alta dignita Episcopale, ed essendone l'argomento di speciale interesse pel Capo Supremo della Chiesa. Rendendole quindi le dovute lodi per avere Ella publicato siffatto lavoro e manifestandole il suo grato animo per le filiali espressioni della detta lettera, benedice di gran cuore la S. V. ed i fedeli affidati al suo pastorale Ministero.

Nel renderla di cio consapevole la ringrazio di cuore per l'altro esemplare cortesemente a me destinato, e con sensi della pui distinta stima mi dichiaro.

DI. V. S. ILLMA E REVMA.

Roma 25 Aprile, 1896.

MONS. THOMAS O'GORMAN,
Epo Siouxarmen.

SERVITORE.

M. CARD. RAMPOLLA.

ROME, April 25, 1896.

RT. REV. SIR: Your letter of the 5th inst. has reached me, with two copies of your manual of the History of the Catholic Church in the United Staes. I hastened to present to the Holy Father, together with your letter, the copy destined for him. It gives me pleasure to make known to you his satisfaction at the reception of your gift, especially as it is a work written by one who has been the object of his particular good-will and confidence, made known by your promotion to the Episcopal dignity. The subject of the work is also especially interesting to him as Supreme Head of the Church.

While he praises you, therefore, for this publication, and expresses his thanks for the filial tone of your letter, he blesses, at the same time, with all his heart, both you and the faithful entrusted to your care.

I seize this occasion to thank you for the copy of your work sent to me, and to express my profound esteem for yourself.

Very devotedly yours,

M. CARD. RAMPOLLA.

MGR. THOMAS O'GORMAN, Bishop of Sioux Falls.

ANALECTA.

LITERATURE.—One of the truest marks of the Catholicity of the Church is the multiplicity, rather the diversity of ways by which her erring sheep return to the fold. However various the immediate causes or motives, there is in all conversions at least one common element—viz: a passionate love of truth.

Augustin Thierry possessed this in an eminent degree, for whether as the enemy or friend of the church, he loved truth, and to it is due the gift of faith. Conversion, however, came late,—when his work was practically over, yet the blind paralytic of well-nigh sixty years started out afresh in order to undo, if possible, the errors of a misguided youth. But it was too late, death coming when he had corrected nought but the Norman Conquest. Bitter must it have been for the historian to confess failure at the very summit of his reputation, but Thierry was an historian, than whom none more highly revered the dignity of his vocation, the example of whose self-sacrifice in the interests of truth is perhaps of far more value to the progress of fair history than his writings.

The reader will find it a pleasing task, indeed, to read this little pamphlet of M. Chérot (*La Conversion d'Augustin Thierry*, Paris, Rétaux, 1896), wherein are laid bare the circumstances of Thierry's conversion by l'Abbé Hamon and M. Gratry, the subsequent attitude of the rational and Protestant world as represented by Renan and Bonnet, the Catholic defence of the church prior to it by Léon Aubineau and the simple-hearted but erudite Abbé Gorini, upon the lines of whose suggestions Thierry began the correction of his works; and, finally, the funeral oration of the Abbé Hamon and a letter of M. Gratry, the two priests who were the personal agents in his conversion.

In the *Bulletin Critique* (March 15) the Père Baudrillart reviews the valuable work of M. Noël Valois, entitled “*La France et le Grand Schisme d'Occident.*” The book gets a judicious combination of praise and stricture. Scientific exactness and study of sources hitherto unconsulted have cleared up some doubtful points, but it seems that M. Valois is sometimes a bit chary of positively affirming conclusions that he has all but demonstrated.

He lets off too easily King Philippe le Bel; and, on the other hand, he should have omitted his "dit-on" in introducing undoubted instances of cruelty permitted by Urban VI. Dietrich von Niem and the "Chronicon Siculum" have put these things beyond all question. In the second volume M. Valois shows himself quite "Avignonnais," and though his opinion is free, as far as Catholic faith is concerned, the critic thinks his science is somewhat at fault, the claim of the Roman Pope having been justified by the very documents and facts presented in the book. True, there was an Italian outcry before the election of Urban; but that it was strong enough to take away from the cardinals their liberty of will does not appear certain. Their conduct would indicate that the majority never thought of opposing or annulling the election until after that fatal fortnight—March 27 to April 10, 1378, the details of which M. Valois brings out with such great precision and vividness. Certain it is that they willingly waited upon the new Pontiff and sent abroad personal notices of his election, in a word,—acted in a way incompatible with their alleged intimidation.

The second essential point in M. Valois's work is his study of the policy of Charles V with regard to the great schism. He has proved that many modifications must be admitted in the traditional accounts; withal he seems to be too indulgent to the King. The action of the royal agent, Cardinal d'Amiens, indicates Charles' responsibility for the decision of the second conclave, and his policy towards the clergy who adhered to Urban was a mere comedy, as M. Valois's revelations prove. It might have cut off all chances of success for the schism had he withdrawn the support of France, but the popular discontent at Rome, the uncertainty of the rights of Urban VI, and the dissatisfaction of the cardinals would have remained, if only as temporary sources of dissensions.

PHILOSOPHICAL.—A strange notion nowaday abroad would shrug metaphysics into unpopularity on the score that it is an arbitrary science of abstractions. Nothing could be wider of the truth. Faults of extravagant schoolmen should not be fastened on their heirs in office as a sort of natural inheritance. "The helpful science," as Mivart aptly terms metaphysics, does not professedly deal with idle abstractions, airy questions as far from reality as Ultima Thule. The compound word itself was invented by Aris-

totle to designate that branch of philosophy which has for special object the nature, properties, and perfections of real being. It is, in other words, when rightly understood, the after-physics, the analytical prosecution, to a further and higher degree, of the Physicist's labors. It deals with incomplete being and rounds out the notions most commonly present among men.

Thus motion, velocity, force, matter and the like, which are real beings one and all, though never found in nature completely existing by themselves, but always as parts of some compound reality into which they enter as components or properties, are certainly not plays upon words, mere mental makeshifts, but realities, hard with the reality of things themselves. What reality yields up to careful scrutiny under the search-light of analysis, is the groundwork of metaphysics.

To say, therefore, that this special field of philosophy is an abstract science of notions out of all touch with reality, an arbitrary imposition of ideas or facts, is an open confession of ignorance concerning its main trend and import. Metaphysics has two methods—the one from cause to effect, the other from effect to cause. If we score it as useless because it employs an *a priori* method in its investigations, consistency compels us to a like averment as regards mathematics and other sciences. The burden of this consequence is one which few among the railers at metaphysics will care to bear. We should, however, keep clearly in mind that the usual method pursued by metaphysicians is one which proceeds from whole to parts, from effects to cause, a mode of procedure in keeping with the most exacting requirements of methodology. The word itself may or may not be a misnomer, if viewed etymologically; yet neither its nature nor methods are in any wise worthy of the opprobrium attaching to its name.

One is not prepared to find serious misstatements in authors of repute, yet it is passing strange to note what a mischief-maker a simple term may be in the minds of those not familiar with its usage. The term "species," ubiquitous among scholastic writers, is scarcely ever caught in its full drift by latter-day philosophers. Even such a reliable author as Noah Porter ranks St. Thomas and the schoolmen in general as mediate realists, because of his failure to grasp the real meaning which "species" was intended to convey to student readers.

The theory of roving images, of entities migrating into the mind from outer objects, was rejected as far back as Aristotle himself, whose doctrine was simply that objects effected certain modifications in the mind of every perceiver by acting on the sense-organs through motions in the intervening media. Thus, he urged against the "fire-image theory" of Empedocles that vision cannot be produced by the radiation of light from the eye, otherwise we could see in the darkness without the instrumentality of light; and, furthermore, that vision cannot be caused by influences or emanations that stream forth from visible objects, for the simple reason that such an agency would require an appreciable length of time for effective action. According to the Stagyrite, visible objects, for instance, do not act directly on the eye of the percipient, but through a transparent agent or medium. This agent or medium, which in his view conditions light, exists more commonly in the form of water and air. From this it may easily be gathered how nearly he approached to the modern theory that light depends on the undulations of an invisible ether.

The modifications effected in the mind by objects acting through the intervening media were, at a later period, denoted by the word "species." It meant a disposition awakened in the mind by the action of an object; it was, in point of fact, the apprehensive act by which the mind reacted upon the action of an outer stimulus and became likened, in some sense, to the stimulating object itself. Mental modifications were mere physical expressions of things without. They were called "species," not because they were thought to be detached likenesses of outer objects, nor because they resembled external objects (*in nature*), but simply and solely because they truly mirrored the surrounding world in the mind itself. For this reason they employed the term "image or species" simply to express the ratio of reaction in the mind perceiving, in order to distinguish the better such reaction from objects as they are in nature, whether viewed inertly in themselves or concertedly in action.

That they are, therefore, mere intermediary images is foreign alike to the term itself and the genuine stamp of meaning it had in the minds of those who were compelled to its employment by the rigors of a time-honored usage.

GRADUATING EXERCISES, 1895-'96.

On Tuesday, June 16, the University closed the seventh year of its work. At 10 o'clock that morning professors and students were gathered in McMahon Hall, Cardinal Gibbons presiding, to witness the conferring of degrees on twenty-seven successful students. Around the Chancellor were gathered the Right Reverend Rector, Bishop Keane; the Very Reverend Vice-Rector, Dr. Garrigan; the Very Reverend Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Dr. Grannan; the Very Reverend Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Dr. Pace; the Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Dr. Robinson, and the entire corps of professors and instructors. A large audience had assembled despite the threatening weather. The opening address was made by the Right Reverend Rector, who spoke as follows:—

The Rector's Address.

Rt. Rev. Bishop Keane opened the exercises and said in substance, that they marked the completion of the seventh year of the work of the Catholic University, and were approached with the deepest gratitude. The past year had been one of especial solicitude and difficulty, because the new Schools of Social Sciences and Philosophy had been added to the School of Divinity and opened, and the problem had been confronted of bringing their conflicting aims into a harmonious whole.

"The Catholic University is to be the University of the twentieth century," said the Rector. "Its face is to the future. Its professors and its students must take into cognizance the studies of the past and present with eyes to the future. The University must be conducted on lines embracing the very highest ideals of the next century, and regard them in the influence they will have on speculative and practical learning."

At the conclusion of the Rector's discourse, Prof. Robinson, Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, presented the following candidates for degrees in the Department of Law:

BACHELORS OF LAWS.

WILLIAM T. CASHMAN,
GEORGE S. CONNELL,

Boston, Mass.
New York City.

MASTERS OF LAWS.

BRAINARD AVERY, ESQ., LL. B.,
JAMES C. BOURKE, ESQ., LL. B.,
JAMES L. KENNEDY, ESQ., LL. B.,
THOMAS D. MOTT, JR., ESQ., LL. B.,

Proctor, Vt.
Kansas City, Mo.
Greensburg, Pa.
Los Angeles, Cal.

Very Rev. Dr. Grannan, Dean of the Faculty of Theology,
then presented the following students for degrees in Theology:

BACHELORS OF DIVINITY.

REV. ALPHONSIUS J. CAREY,
REV. JOHN W. CUMMINGS,
REV. MAURICE M. HASSETT,
REV. JAMES M. KIRWIN, A. B.,
REV. JOHN F. O'NEIL,
REV. FRANCIS J. SHEEHAN,
REV. JOSEPH H. TETTEMER,

St. Paul, Minn.
Peoria, Ill.
Harrisburg, Pa.
Galveston, Tex.
Philadelphia, Pa.
Philadelphia, Pa.
St. Louis, Mo.

LICENTIATES IN DIVINITY.

REV. JOHN J. CLIFFORD, A. B., S. T. B.,
REV. CORNELIUS F. CROWLEY, S. T. B.,
REV. JAMES F. DOLAN, S. T. B.,
REV. WILLIAM J. FOGARTY, S. T. B.,
REV. JOHN FLEMING, S. T. B., J. C. B.,
REV. WILLIAM J. FUTTERER, S. T. B.,
REV. FRANCIS GILFILLAN, S. T. B.,
REV. GEORGE GLAAB, S. T. B.,
REV. PATRICK J. KEANE, S. T. B.,
REV. JAMES J. KEANE, A. B., S. T. B.,
REV. JOHN J. LYNCH, S. T. B.,
REV. EDWARD E. O'BRIEN, A. B., S. T. B.,

Monterey, Cal.
New York, N. Y.
Albany, N. Y.
Cincinnati, Ohio.
Hartford, Conn.
Alton, Ill.
St. Louis, Mo.
Washington, D. C.
San Francisco, Cal.
New York, N. Y.
Albany, N. Y.
Detroit, Mich.

When the Cardinal had conferred the degrees, Mr. Thomas D. Mott, Jr., of Los Angeles, California, delivered the following address in the name of his fellow-graduates:

Your Eminence, Right Reverend Rector, Reverend Fathers and Professors, Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the time of his graduation the college-man enters, as it were, into a land of mist. We expect, we hope, we predict, but we are not sure. An atmosphere of uncertainty envelopes all things. But as the University graduate has advanced a step further in life's journey we can expect from him an immediate answer as to the meaning and purpose of his degree and the uses to which he intends to dedicate it.

To us of the School of the Social Sciences, who have been to-day honored at your hands, the degrees conferred are full of meaning and replete with import. If they certify to a certain excellence in those studies to which we have devoted ourselves, they also affirm that we have but attained a point of recognition beyond which we are expected and are called upon to climb; if our degrees tell of duties performed in the past, they also serve as silent admonishers of the future, urging us to maintain steadfastly the right, whenever and in whatever form it may present itself. Our degrees evidence expectations fulfilled, but they also speak of hopes to be realized by remaining constant in those traits of character, and that assiduous application of study, which have enabled us to win the coveted honor which is ours—indeed our degrees are vocal with the information that to-day a trust has been imposed upon us, and that we are expected so to discharge as to bring honor on ourselves and reflect credit on this University.

Understanding then and appreciating the full significance of the degrees, it is not too much for me to say in behalf of my classmates, that in their acceptance is given the promise of our high resolve to dedicate the knowledge of which these degrees are symbolic to the ends intended by the Faculty in conferring them.

With this purpose in mind we shall always remember the code of Christian ethics which forms the basis of law. Textbooks and authorities we shall consult indeed, but the first inquiry shall be, 'What is right?' Having founded the fabric of the law upon a system of jurisprudence laid down by St. Thomas in his immortal principles as to the nature, character, and object of human law, we have succeeded in erecting an edifice that shall be dedicated not merely to commercial ends, but shall serve those higher purposes of right and justice in whose triumph no man so great but he may be proud to be identified.

We realize, and our convictions are deep-rooted, that the lawyer who uses his profession merely as a commercial instrument, solely as a means of obtaining recognition, place, or wealth fails in his highest duty; that he thus subordinates to lower and selfish ends the powers which he but holds in trust for the benefit of the common-good, and which he should employ to the furthering of those principles, the victory of which will redound to the welfare and the betterment of his fellow-men.

That this should always be borne in mind is all the more necessary in our country, since here the well-equipped lawyer cannot consider himself a mere special pleader, for he is often called upon to participate in the making of the laws that direct the destinies of America.

We have entered upon an endless study, the field is as broad as life, as extensive as human acts and human affairs. No one man in his short time and with his limited intellect can hope to become the full master of this study; but by ceaseless application, by constant research, by never-tiring efforts, and by the aid of light and strength from above he can indeed hope to leave his impress on the legal history of his country.

We have promised much, but perhaps not more than was expected. We pray and hope for the strength to be ever faithful to our pledges, and that by the fruit we bear men may know we are graduates of the Catholic University of America.

Rev. George Glaab, pastor of St. Mary's Church, Washington, D. C., spoke as follows in the name of the theological graduates :

Your Eminence, Rt. Rev. Rector, Rev. Professors, and Fathers,
Ladies and Gentlemen :

If it be true, as we read in the Sacred Scriptures, that we have but one teacher, it follows that the mission of those who are charged by Divine Providence with the solemn duty of teaching, explaining and defending the doctrine of Jesus Christ and His Church is one of the noblest to which a Christian heart can aspire on earth. It is especially of such that the Prophet says: "How great is he that findeth wisdom and knowledge." (Eccl. 25, 13.) Hence we can readily understand why the Holy Spirit eulogizes so unstintingly by the exalted office of the interpreter of the divine doctrine when he says: "Blessed is he that declarereth justice to an ear that heareth." (Eccl. 25, 12.) We

can also understand the joy which the Apostle, called the theologian, experienced in seeing his disciples studying and following the ways of truth: "I have no greater grace than this, to hear that my children walk in truth." (III John, I, 4.)

Venerated professors, we came to this University "to know wisdom and instruction: "to understand the words of prudence, and to receive the instruction of doctrine, justice, and judgment, and equity." (Prov. I, 2-3.) Fully cognizant that the University erected under the auspices of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, has for the starting point of its existence, as well as of its teaching the noble motto: "Deus lux mea," we have sought from your lips, Rev. Professors, with unhesitating confidence, this doctrine of Christ, repeating with the royal prophet: "Bonitatem et disciplinam et scientiam doce me." (Ps. 118.)

And how happy are we to declare that our confidence has not only not been misplaced, but that our most ambitious hopes have been fully realized. We have been daily witnesses of your untiring labors in our behalf, and daily beneficiaries of your self-sacrificing toil. The example of intellectual activity you have given us will not fail, I am sure, to exert a stimulating influence on our whole future career. It is not for us to say whether our own efforts have been such as to make us a source of joy and consolation to you, as were the disciples of St. John to that great Apostle, but it is our duty to thank Divine Providence for having led as to this hallowed sanctuary of learning, and to thank our venerated professors who have been for us the faithful exponents of the teachings of Christ and of his Church.

Having been charged to be the interpreter of the sentiments of gratitude which animate us all, I regret only this one thing, that my feeble words, dear professors, cannot rise to the level of your merits, nor to the height of the thankful sentiments with which we are filled. However, we do not doubt that the kindly indulgence of which you have already given so many eloquent proofs during our sojourn at this institution will also on this occasion overlook our deficiencies and take account of our good will.

Esteemed Professors, I should deceive your expectations, I should do violence to your hearts, as well as to those of my fellow-students and my own, if I did not associate with these sentiments of gratitude and love that noble and beautiful soul whose sudden and violent departure from our midst has cast us

all into the depths of sadness and gloom. The good Lord has been pleased to hasten his journey toward the possession of the light of eternal glory, without giving him time to put into execution here below the brilliant acquisitions he made in this house by his talents and generous efforts. With the promise of ever preserving for him a faithful remembrance as Christians, as fellow-students, and as priests, I do not hesitate to add the expression of our unanimous conviction that our beloved Father Fogarty will second in heaven our good wishes and prayers for the University and for all its respected superiors and professors.

O cherished Alma Mater, worthy daughter of that glorious mother on whose immaculate brow the grateful nations have inscribed the sweet words, Sancta Mater Ecclesia! may the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the God of Sciences continue to support your maternal efforts in quickening the minds and directing the activity of the youth of the sanctuary for your own aggrandizement, for the glory of His Holy Church, and for the honor of our beloved country.

The exercises were brought to an end by a discourse of the Cardinal Chancellor, whose text we give below. At its conclusion the entire assemblage assisted at the Te Deum and Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament sung by the Cardinal, as a thanksgiving for the success of the year, and notably of the work of McMahon Hall. Before separating the Cardinal held a short informal reception in the parlor of Caldwell Hall for the members of the various faculties.

Discourse of His Eminence the Chancellor.

In adding my congratulations to the distinction which the University has just conferred upon her successful candidates I wish to emphasize some features which give this occasion a peculiar character. It is evident, first of all, that this seventh year in the life of the University has not been a year of rest. To inaugurate and carry on any one of the courses which have been given is, in itself, a considerable undertaking. But a far more difficult task has been accomplished in the coördination of many departments in these newly-established schools, and in adjusting the relations of all the schools in such a way as to further the interests of the whole institution. This work of organization, arduous as it is, makes no display to the public eye, and, consequently, gets no immediate appreciation. And yet is

essential; it requires judgment and foresight; it reaches to a future which we cannot even foresee; it conditions the life-course, the aspirations, and the labors of men who are yet unborn. Hence I cannot but thank those who have bent their energies and bestowed their time upon this momentous enterprise while I encourage them to the full and perfect discharge of this all-important duty.

PROGRESS OF THE UNIVERSITY.

A noteworthy advance has already been made by the very fact that so many branches of learning have been brought into contact, that with the teaching of Theology are now associated courses in Philosophy, in Letters, in the Physical Sciences, and in Law. It was not possible to open such courses without affecting in some degree those which were already in operation in the School of Divinity. The development of the University is not like the formation of a crystal, adding layer on layer to be held by an outward cohesion. It is rather an organic growth, the assimilation of new elements, and the adjustment of all functions. This process demands a certain co-operation among the various departments, and this, I am glad to know, has been in a large measure secured during the year just past. Indeed, there is a gratifying evidence of such harmonious relations in the fact that to-day, for the first time in the history of the University, degrees have been conferred upon students from these several schools; that the laity have taken their place at the side of the clergy, thus initiating on the noble plane of intellectual effort that helpful co-operation in the matters of practical life which the Church so earnestly desires. This fact, I say, which only the Catholic University makes possible, is of itself ample justification for the existence of such an institution. It is the palpable result of that organizing process to which I have just referred, and a proof that organization has, so far at least, been conducted on proper lines.

THE HIGHEST CATHOLIC SCHOOL OF LEARNING.

Another hopeful sign pointing in the same direction is the high standard which has been set both in the courses of instruction and in the conditions for degrees. The necessity for such a standard is perfectly obvious to all who are acquainted with the uplifting tendency of other universities in this country and

in Europe. We cannot shut our eyes to the facts of educational advance; much less can we afford to perpetuate the notion that the graduate of a Catholic institution must needs go elsewhere if he would find the best opportunities for research or the best training for his professional career. This may have been a necessity in the past; but such a necessity, we may confidently say, is diminishing year by year. For if it be a matter of congratulation that Catholic colleges can prepare students to enter the oldest of our universities, it should be no less gratifying to the truly Catholic mind that we have now an institution which is ready to take the brightest college graduate and lead him along the higher paths of scientific investigation. Whatever he has received of culture, whatever of preparatory training in the languages, in the exact and physical sciences, in history, and arts, and philosophy—all this will avail him much when he comes here to pursue, with larger facilities, the studies to which his tastes or his interests incline him. He should not, therefore, be discouraged when he perceives in these University courses long vistas of knowledge and great possibilities of original work. He should rather be grateful that a wider horizon is opened to his view; that fruitful methods are placed in his hands; that noble examples of scientific achievement are proposed for his imitation; that the world's best thought is pressed upon him; that he has an opportunity of contributing by his own effort to the development of that thought and to the furtherance of truth. This conviction alone, this widening out of the mental range, is no little reward of the first year spent in these halls, and this conviction, I venture to say, is uppermost in the minds of all who look back to the day of their matriculation.

DUTIES OF UNIVERSITY GRADUATES.

It is a conviction, gentlemen, which you must carry with you into the sphere of duty which you are called to enter. Remember that you are University men, that you have had opportunities of improvement not granted to all. Remember that your diploma derives its worth not only from the seal set upon it, but also and principally from the way in which you verify its statements. The granting of a degree is more than an attestation of service already rendered in the cause of science; it imposes an obligation, and the only way to fulfill this obligation is to make your conduct and your work of such sort that your alma mater

may ever point to you with pride. You have gotten an idea of higher things ; spread it. You have learned that the Church is the friend of science ; teach others the same truth. You know, above all, that this institution is the embodiment of the highest Catholic culture, and of the fairest Catholic hopes ; let this knowledge be your guide whenever and wherever the name of the University is at stake. I am encouraged to address you in these terms by what has taken place within the last few months. I am certain you will not suffer from isolation because the alumni of the University are already banded together with the noble resolve that their alma mater shall be a success. And it is my earnest hope that every one who finishes his studies here may share in that resolve and become an active member of the Alumni Association. This is a kind of teaching which every one of you can carry on, be he bachelor, master, or doctor. It is a lesson which the world can understand ; because it shows that Catholics, laity and clergy alike, are joined by intellectual bonds and by the strong ties that grow out of intellectual pursuits carried on in the same intellectual center. Many of you, quitting the University, must engage in the work of practical careers, as priests in the God-given task of ministering to souls, as professional men in bettering the conditions of humanity or in turning to useful purpose the knowledge you have here received. But some at least are destined to be in a measure coöoperators with those who have instructed them, to imitate the models that have been placed before them ; in a word, to be teachers. These men inspire us with hope. They have caught the spirit of the University ; they are trained in the best methods ; they know from experience the requisites for profitable work ; they will infuse new life wherever they go and continually raise the level of preparatory study. But to do this they must realize their own dignity. They must convince themselves that college professor who takes in hand the pliable mind of youth can mould it, if he will, and develop it to the highest intellectual and moral perfection. Once the importance of this formation is rightly understood, the task of adjusting the various factors in our Catholic educational system will be comparatively easy. It is not so much a multiplication of studies that we need as thoroughness in those which are now pursued.

CO-ORDINATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY.

To secure such thoroughness, without lengthening unreasonably the college course, is a work that requires constant attention both to our own conditions and to the progress which is made in other institutions. The movements which are continually adding to our scientific knowledge, and thereby adding to what we call elementary knowledge, a steady supply of facts, must be closely watched. The improvements in method, based upon experience and upon a clearer comprehension of mental growth, should be considered seriously, and wherever it is possible, adopted. Habits of observation, precision of thought, elegance of expression, love of study, and, above all, initiative, are the qualities which we expect from the graduate. To cultivate these qualities is the all-important duty of the college. To make them of avail along lines of special research is what we propose in the University. This was evidently the intention of the Sovereign Pontiff when, at the opening of our new schools last October, he urged the colleges to send hither their most promising graduates. And if he has lately ratified with his benediction the step so wisely and so loyally taken by one of our great teaching communities in founding at our gates a house of study, it is because he desires the hearty co-operation of all, and because he is well pleased with this proof of obedience to his behest.

NEED OF SYMPATHY AND GENEROSITY.

This steady widening of the University's sphere of influence should be an evidence to all that this institution is not only a reality, but also a useful reality—a source of benefit to every department of Catholic life. For with an educated clergy and an educated laity the Church will easily maintain her position as a leading and beneficial factor in the growth of our country. But for this purpose it is needful to remember that the University is the work, not of one body in the Church, nor of a chosen few, it is a work in which every Catholic is concerned. Its administration and its teaching must necessarily be confided to a limited number; but these men, after all, only serve the cause of the entire Catholic body. Their efficiency depends not alone on their personal efforts, but also on the generous coöperation of their fellow-Catholics.

No one who understands the aim of the University can fail

to sympathize with it, and sympathy is the beginning of coöperation. No one who realizes what has been accomplished in less than a decade can doubt of the ultimate success of this enterprise, and confidence is the soul of coöperation. The moral support implied in sympathy and confidence is invaluable to the University, but it does not exhaust our duty as Catholics. It does not make us fair competitors with those of our non-Catholic fellow-citizens, whose generosity is the mainstay of university education. They clearly understand that a university, in the true sense of the word, involves great expense; that libraries and laboratories, with even what is absolutely necessary by way of equipment, are costly. But they also realize that every dollar spent in this direction is a good investment both as a source of honor to themselves and as a means of good to others. This spirit of generosity is by no means lacking among Catholics. All that it needs is wise direction, and the progress of the University along with its manifold needs points plainly the course which their generosity should take. With scholarships and fellowships to be founded, chairs to be endowed, various institutes to be provided for, there is ample scope for Catholic liberality. Brilliant examples have already been given by those whose names are inscribed on our buildings or attached to different chairs. We face the future with the trust that such examples may be imitated, and that every Catholic in the United States may become a co-worker with us in the accomplishment of our task.

In the meantime we cannot close this year without being heartily thankful for the blessings which the Almighty has vouchsafed us. We undertook this work in the firm conviction that it was God's work, and in this conviction we shall carry it on. Difficulties, no doubt, await us, but they will not be the first that we have met and overcome. With the Divine assistance, which we now go to implore before the altar, we shall enter with renewed strength and courage upon the work of another year.

REV. WILLIAM J. FOGARTY, S. T. L.

It is our sad duty to chronicle the death of Rev. William J. Fogarty, a priest of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati and one of the University's most promising students. Language cannot express the exquisite anguish caused by his unexpected and tragic end.

Not only his heart-broken parents, but countless friends throughout the country lament a noble heart that has ceased to beat, an angelic intellect that has given its last brilliant flash. He was in all things a model of youth, and in his brief span of life has left a monument of good works to which all may look and receive inspiration and hope. Words cannot depict for those who knew him not the modesty, purity, and gentleness of his life, and to those who knew him and his yearning to serve his Divine Master words are not necessary.

Born in Springfield, Ohio, January 16, 1871, he was baptized in St. Raphael's Church. His early education was conducted by the Sisters of Charity attached to the parochial school. The boy was father to the man. Gentle, obliging, never thinking of self, he was always ready to accommodate his wants and his inclinations to the wishes and caprices of others. Kindness to his companions, zeal in the allotted tasks of the school, reverence for his pastor, and a saintly ardor for the sanctuary were the rays which pointed to the hidden sun of his vocation. To realize this vocation to the Divine ministry was his constant aim and prayer. But circumstances compelled him to defer his hopes, and having made his first Holy Communion he sought and found employment in a printing establishment of his native city. In his heart, however, was the sacred fire which could not be quenched, the sacred fire of his vocation kindled to greater ardor and brilliancy by the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

He left the printer's shop and repaired to the College of Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburgh. In this institution he remained for four years, and was remarked for his talents, his steady zeal, and above all for his gentle unassuming piety. He graduated with high honors in his class, and left to enter the Provincial Seminary of Mount St. Mary's of the West, Cincinnati, in 1889.

Here the writer first met him, in the fall of 1890, now six years ago, and faithfully can we testify that during that time, notwithstanding the crosses and trials and buffetings, the yearnings and anxieties, perplexities and denials that beset the way to the accomplishment of the levite's one desire, Father Fogarty never lost the sweet calm, the same smoothness of brow, and the gentle kindness of word and look which characterized him as a child. Time passed and the longed-for day of ordination came, the sacred unction was placed upon his hands, the grace of the Holy Spirit descended into that heart always as pure as the snow-drift and he was a priest forever. "He looked," said a bystander, "more like an angel than a human being." His ordination took place at Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Cincinnati, June 19, 1894. He was now ready to go forth in the footsteps of his beloved Master, ready to use that rich store of learning which he had garnered during the eight years of his student life.

His talents, however, were conspicuous, and he was chosen by the Faculty of the Seminary and the Most Rev. Archbishop to represent the archdiocese of Cincinnati at the Catholic University of America. The active work of the mission would have better pleased his zealous nature, but his burning ardor for knowledge induced him to accept the proffered honor, and he entered the University in September, 1894. Proficient in all his studies, an intimate acquaintance with Hebrew, Latin, and German naturally induced him to pursue the Biblical sciences. His English composition portrays the chasteness of his style and the loftiness of his thought. He excelled in prose, but occasionally contributed to the Catholic weeklies selections in poetry.

He was eminently successful at the University. This is attested by the fact that he was twice offered a professorship, with the understanding that he was to complete his education in the intellectual centers of Europe. No greater honor than the offer of a chair in the Catholic University can be conferred upon an American priest, but he declined. The diocese of Cincinnati was his home. To it was due his mind and heart, and he was to assume the professorship of Sacred Scripture in Mount St. Mary's of the West next September.

The Faculty of Divinity was disappointed in not securing him. This disappointment was augmented a few days since by the brilliancy with which he passed the public examination for the Licentiate of Theology. His dissertation on "The Date of

the Composition of the Book of Job" and his public defense of fifty theses well deserved "Maxima cum Laude."

He was awaiting the final ceremony of the conferring of the Licentiate when he fell from his window and received the injury which resulted in his death June 13. The accident occurred on the evening of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, on which day two years since the University suffered a similar loss in the death of Father Bruin.

Thus closed a life in the luxuriant bloom of its spring, freighted with the promise of great, enduring work for God. "None knew him but to love him; none named him but to praise," and in considering all, our only resource is to bend to the inscrutable will of a merciful, omniscient Providence, who ruleth all things sweetly. In writing last spring on the death of a young priest remarkable for piety and learning, Father Fogarty said: "We cannot understand now the divine plans of God in our behalf, but when we are taken to Himself we shall see that Providence doeth all things well. We shall see the plan of creation unsolved, and then we shall know that God is all loving, all-wise, and all good." Beautiful words! too soon, alas! realized in himself.

Preceding the departure of the remains for his home, the professors and students of the University attended in a body the sad rites at Providence Hospital. The Rector touchingly referred to his brilliant career and prospects, and his sorrowful mother and friends. Father Cummings accompanied the body to the West. The funeral took place in St. Raphael's, his parochial church, Springfield, Ohio. Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Byrne, of Nashville, sang the Mass and pronounced the last absolution. The panegyric was preached by his life-long friend and pastor, Very Rev. W. H. Sidley. He was learned without ostentation, pious without cant, simple without affectation, and his character was a blending of all the admirable qualities we most desire in the priest of God. He united decision without severity, gentleness without weakness, and permeating all was the uniform sweetness which sprung from his childlike heart. He was a friend to cherish within the tenderest depths of the heart, a son and brother to love with the generous enthusiasm born of those closest and tenderest bonds of humanity. The world is better for his having lived.



VATICAN WINDOW.

ST. STEPHEN'S, New York. ST. MARY'S, Charlestown. Boston.
 ST. JOHN EVANGELIST, New York. GEORGETOWN COLLEGE, Wash., D.C.
 CONVENT SACRED HEART, Manhat'lle. ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, Fordham, N. Y.
 CHURCH ST. AGNES, Brooklyn, N. Y. CHURCH ST. CECILLIA, Brooklyn.
 ST. IGNATIUS, San Francisco, Cal. CHURCH ST. ANTHONY, Brooklyn.

NEW YORK BRANCH, 47 Barclay Street.

IMPORTANT PUBLICATION.

Christ in Type and Prophecy.

By REV. A. J. MAAS, S. J. 2 vols., 12mo, cloth. Net, \$4.00.

Manuals of Catholic Philosophy.

Logic, net, \$1.25; First Principles of Knowledge, net, \$1.25; Moral Philosophy, net, \$1.25; Natural Theology, net, \$1.50; Psychology, net, \$1.50; General Metaphysics, net, \$1.25; Political Economy, net, \$1.50.

Outlines of Dogmatic Theology.

By REV. SYLVESTER J. HUNTER, S. J. 3 vols., 12mo, cloth.
Net, \$4.50

The Priest in the Pulpit.

A Manual of Homiletics and Catechetics. Adapted from the German of Rev. I. Schnech, by REV. BONIFACE LUEBBERMANN. Preface by ARCHBISHOP ELDER. 8vo, cloth. Net, \$1.50
This is the first issue of a series of Manuals on Pastoral Theology.

Sold by all Catholic Booksellers and Agents.

BENZIGER BROTHERS,

NEW YORK: 36-38 Barclay St.	CINCINNATI: 343 Main St.	CHICAGO: 178 Monroe St.
---------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------